

THE

SECOND ADVENT DOCTRINE  
VINDICATED.

A

SERMON

PREACHED AT THE DEDICATION

OF

THE TABERNACLE.

BY REV. S. HAWLEY.

WITH THE ADDRESS OF THE TABERNACLE  
COMMITTEE.

---

BOSTON:  
PUBLISHED BY JOSHUA V. HIMES,  
14 Devonshire Street.  
1843.

THE BOOK OF THE

THE BOOK OF THE

THE BOOK OF THE

THE BOOK OF THE

THE BOOK OF THE

THE BOOK OF THE

THE BOOK OF THE

THE BOOK OF THE

THE BOOK OF THE

THE BOOK OF THE

THE BOOK OF THE

THE  
SECOND ADVENT DOCTRINE  
VINDICATED.

Δ  
SERMON  
PREACHED AT THE DEDICATION  
OF  
THE TABERNACLE.

BY REV. S. HAWLEY.

WITH THE ADDRESS OF THE TABERNACLE  
COMMITTEE.

---

BOSTON:  
PUBLISHED BY JOSHUA V. HIMES,  
14 Devonshire Street.  
1843.



## DISCOURSE.

---

—“*I will overturn, overturn, overturn it; and it shall be no more, until he come whose right it is; and I will give it him.*”

Ezek. xxi. 27.

As Christ is the end of the Law, so is he the end of Prophecy. It all centres in him. This fact gives it its character, its interest, its importance, its glory. His work, as restorer of what was lost by sin, is the point to which the prophecy directs and holds the attention. But the features of this work are only gradually unfolded. We have, first, a general and indefinite promise, an obscure hint, and then occasional predictions having no apparent connection or order; and, subsequently, others, definite and connected, bringing out all the parts of the work, and giving order, system, and beauty to the whole. We have the rough outline, and then the filling up—the chaotic mass, and then the shaping of the whole into order, harmony, and beauty. Often, in the prophecy, great events, though different in character, and separate as to time, are grouped together, and presented to view as though really connected. But increased light, arising

from additional revelations, shows their true order. Sometimes we have the events properly arranged, without any clues as to the times and seasons of their occurrence. These, also, at the proper time and place, are furnished.

But this method is only adopted in regard to the events of the distant future. All the light that is requisite at any one period, is abundantly furnished. The only light that could have been needed, in reference to the distant future, was enough to give form and direction to the faith, and to fix the hope of God's people. And this has steadily increased, as the periods towards which the prophecy directed the eye, have approached. The first great promise, made in Eden, contains, in the smallest limits, the whole truth and history of redemption. The whole of its mysteries, its successes, its reverses, its conflicts, its victories, its glories, are included in that single brief announcement. It comprises, in miniature form, the most stupendous truths, the grandest displays of moral power, the most brilliant conquests, and the highest state of bliss and glory. The Bible is merely an expansion and illustration of that great promise. It will require an eternity to give us the idea in its fulness, richness, glory. But the truth it presented, like the shapeless and unorganized elements of the earth at their creation, was in a chaotic state. It was needful to give it form, order, symmetry.

It was needful to bring out the means by which, and the times and seasons at which, it was to have its fulfilment. This is the work of the Bible. But it was a gradual work. Its revelations become more and more clear, definite, and systematic. Its light grows brighter and brighter to its completion. We have now the full plan, in all its parts. We have the events and their order, the truths and their classification. But these are not given on one page, or always in the same connection, and yet, in many instances, they are presented in such succinctness, such order, as to make all plain to the careful reader.

The text is a prophecy unfolding the order of the most important events connected with the great work of Christ. It is one of the prophecies relating to order. It stretches over a vast space of time, and fixes the mind upon two great crises or turning points that would occur during that period, and the state of things succeeding each. The first is, the entire subversion of the kingdom of Israel, succeeded by a long and gloomy period of desolation and dispersion; the last is, the coming of Christ to restore the kingdom, followed by the millennial state of bliss and glory. It involves, therefore, a fearful threatening, and a cheering promise. The first is to have its full execution before the other is fulfilled. For how long a period the threatening has been in process of execution ! More

than two thousand four hundred years have passed since it commenced ! But the work of vengeance is not yet done. The kingdom is yet in ruins. He, to whom it belongs, has not yet come. And, to look for anything but overturning, change, desolation, and depression until that time, is to disregard the Bible, and to cherish expectations most certainly to be disappointed. All this side of that point, will be, to God's people, a period of sorrow, darkness, affliction, and trial ; for the mouth of the Lord hath spoken it. When he comes whose the kingdom is, their days of mourning will be ended, and the period of their joys and rejoicings will begin.

I propose on this occasion to discuss the following points.

I. THE PERSONAL REIGN OF CHRIST ON EARTH.

II. THE IDENTITY OF THE MILLENNIUM WITH THAT REIGN.

III. THE PREPARATORY EVENTS OF THAT REIGN.

IV. THE PRIVILEGES AND ENJOYMENTS OF THAT REIGN.

V. THE EVIDENCES THAT THAT REIGN IS ABOUT TO BEGIN.

I propose to pass over this wide field of investigation, for two reasons. *First*, to correct, if possible, the common impression that the only thing that distinguishes the believers in the personal coming of Christ near, *is the time*. This impression has not been made without effort. The opposers of our views



seem disposed to narrow down the matters of difference to this one point. To this we strongly object. We feel determined that the real points at issue between us shall be kept fully, and in their true light, before the public mind. My *second* reason is, that I may set before the hearer the true grounds of our faith, and the real basis of our hope. Those who oppose us, either deny or disregard our premises. In most cases, it is the latter. Where this is so, we can look for nothing but opposition. We claim to have a faith that is founded on evidence. And we think we are not so irrational, not so far gone in fanaticism, as not to know that our conclusions are no sounder than our premises—that our faith is no better than the evidence on which it rests. If they fail, or are proved unsound, the system must fail. If they stand, it will survive unharmed the fiercest and most desperate opposition. We wish, therefore, the question to be met on its merits, and to have a decision in the face of all our evidences. But a synopsis of these is all that I can hope to give in the present discourse.

The point in order is—

#### I. THE PERSONAL REIGN OF CHRIST ON EARTH.

This point is vital to the system we advocate. In the system it holds a central position. On it must turn the whole question. For, though the question of time should be

decided in our favor, there would then be ground for difference respecting the events to be expected. The character of the reign looked for, must decide the character of those events. If it be once admitted that Christ is to come to reign personally, we cannot see how our view of the character of accompanying events can be disputed. A personal reign implies a personal coming, and the events of such a coming all must admit to be such as we expect. But if Christ is only to commence a spiritual reign, our view of those events must be acknowledged to be wrong, and opposed to the Bible. To this point, then, attention is invited.

1. *The text I present as the highest proof of a personal reign.*

To give it its full force, a little explanation is needed. Four points of inquiry are involved in it. The first two of these cannot be doubtful; the last two will require some consideration. The points are: 1. What was intended by that which was to be overturned and destroyed? 2. Who was meant by he that should come, whose it was by right, and to whom it should be given? 3. What particular coming was referred to? 4. What was to be the character of the coming? If we find the *first* of these to be the kingdom of Israel; the *second*, Christ; the *third*, his second advent; the *fourth*, a personal coming; all will be plain and incontrovertible. As to the first two points of inquiry,

as already remarked, there can be no doubt. That the two subjects of the prophecy are the kingdom of Israel and Christ, all the candid and judicious allow. Indeed, it is so clear as to command almost universal assent. The whole prophecy, including the context, pronounces the doom of Zedekiah, and the kingdom over which he unworthily and wickedly reigned. He was the last king that ever sat on the throne of Israel. His character and fate are thus faithfully set forth by the prophet: "And thou, profane wicked prince of Israel, whose day is come, when iniquity shall have an end; thus saith the Lord God, Remove the diadem, and take off the crown; this shall not be the same; exalt him that is low, and abase him that is high." Then follows the prophecy constituting the text, showing the destiny of the kingdom. "I will overturn, overturn, overturn it; and it shall be no more, until he come whose right it is; and I will give it him."

The glory, dignity, and independence of the kingdom had before this passed away; and now its entire subversion is decreed. The stroke by which it lost its sovereignty fell in the days of Manasseh. From his time to the period of the delivery of this prophecy, it rapidly declined in strength and glory. Though of divine origin and of celestial model, it had wonderfully degenerated and fallen. From its subjects and rulers

God had received the greatest provocations. They became a nation of idolators. They despised the origin, the model, the rightful king of their kingdom. They desired a kingdom modeled after the governments of this world, and a king like the nations around them. This God permitted, in his wrath. But the supreme power of the kingdom, when secured, was, for the most part of the time of its subsequent existence, used for the wickedest and vilest purposes. So perverted had it become from its original purpose, that God determined on its overthrow. But he was slow in the execution of his purpose, that space might be given for amendment and reform. The Assyrians assailed and weakened it; the Egyptians annoyed and diminished it; and the Babylonians took away its independence. But, despite these judgments and other means of reform, the nation waxed worse and worse. Its day had now come. Its measure of guilt was full. The time of its overthrow and subversion had approached. The stroke fell in the eleventh year of the reign of Zedekiah, in the year 588 B. C. Nebuchadnezzar was made the instrument of this work. He commenced, and prosecuted with much zeal and skill, a siege against Jerusalem of eighteen months' continuance, and took it, pillaged the temple, carried out the vessels of the sanctuary, burned it with fire, destroyed the palace, overthrew the whole city, and carried Zedekiah, and the

remnant that escaped the slaughter of the siege, to Babylon, where he met a terrible doom. Thus ended the dynasty of Israel. Never since that period has one set on the throne of David. Though the nation was restored, the crown has not been replaced. One, by the name of Hyrcanus, assumed regal authority, but he was slain, and succeeded by Herod. The Chronicles thus mournfully close this account: "Therefore he brought upon them the king of the Chaldeans, who slew their young men with the sword in the house of their sanctuary, and had no compassion upon young man or maiden, old man or him that stooped for age; he gave them all into his hand. And all the vessels of the house of God, great and small, and the treasures of the house of the Lord, and the treasures of the king and of his princes, all these he brought to Babylon. And they burnt the house of God, and brake down the wall of Jerusalem, and burnt all the palaces thereof with fire, and destroyed all the goodly vessels thereof. And them that escaped of the sword carried he away to Babylon, where they were servants to him and his sons, until the reign of the kingdom of Persia." Soon after the commencement of the Persian reign, they were restored, *but without a king*. God's decree was not to be revoked. It had gone out of his mouth, and could not return, that the kingdom should be OVERTURNED, OVERTURNED, OVERTURNED, AND BE

NO MORE, UNTIL HE SHOULD COME WHOSE RIGHT IT IS.

We now come to consider the only points that need elucidation and proof. These relate to the coming intended, and the character of it. As Christ is, beyond all dispute, the one who was to come, and to whom the kingdom was to be given, it is necessary, *first*, to inquire whether his first or a subsequent coming be meant. And this, it seems, will admit of a very easy answer. All allow that Christ, after his first coming, in some sense was to come again. The testimony of Scripture is so ample and explicit, touching this point, as to preclude all shadow of doubt. Whether the prophecy referred to his first or this subsequent coming, is now the matter of inquiry. A few considerations will make this plain to all.

1. It was not among the objects of his first coming, to reign. One fact will show this. There were two classes of prophecies, as well as two classes of types, unlike and opposite in their nature to each other, to be fulfilled by Christ. The first class set him forth as a *man*, of low and obscure origin, without personal attractions;—as a *sufferer*;—as one subject to temptations, sorrow, trial, and other ills incident to life;—as an object of hatred, scorn, reproach, and unceasing persecution;—as one delivered to his enemies, to have a mock-trial, to be taunted, spit upon, and in various ways insulted, and at last to

be put to death, as the highest offender known to law;—and as one who was to experience the gloom of the grave, and be raised, and, in due time, to pass into the heavens, and appear as a priest in the presence of God. The other class present him as the Lord of glory, clothed with majesty, coming in vengeance to judge the world, and dashing his enemies to pieces as a potter's vessel, and swaying his sceptre over the whole earth;—as the one who should redeem his people from all their enemies, their sorrows, their afflictions, and introduce them into the renovated earth, and be their King forever and ever. The one class relate to his coming in humiliation;—the other to his coming in glory. The one class describe him as a spiritual Redeemer;—the other as a physical Redeemer. The one class refer to him as a Prophet, Priest, Sacrifice;—the other as a Judge, Rewarder, King. The first class point to his coming to proclaim the acceptable year of the Lord;—the other to his coming to proclaim the day of God's vengeance. These prophecies and types, so entirely opposite in their character, could not be fulfilled at one time, or at one manifestation of himself. All can see that he could not appear in these opposite characters, assume these opposite forms, perform these opposite things, and receive such opposite treatment, at one and the same coming. But which class of prophecies and types did he fulfil at his first coming? All will say, the

first. If so, his first coming was not to reign. His coming to restore the kingdom of Israel, must be looked for at a subsequent period.

2. Facts, known to all, clearly demonstrate, that the prophecy did not point to the first appearing of Messiah, as the period of its fulfilment. Nothing occurred at that time that approached towards a fulfilment of it. The kingdom of Israel was to be subject to overturnings, and cease to be, until Christ should come to receive it, to whom it belonged by right. But when he came he did not receive it; he refused the crown; he left it, as he found it, in ruins! And forty years after, the last vestige of it was by the Romans destroyed, and its seat and capital utterly laid waste. And need I tell what has been its fate since? The world know what it has been. The withering decree of the Almighty is yet upon it. "NO MORE" are the two words of the prophecy that contain its history. Another coming, then, must be intended, or the prediction has failed. None of my Christian hearers will allow the latter.

3. The Saviour, just prior to his ascension to heaven, in reply to a question of the disciples, relating to the time of the restoration of the kingdom, gave them most decidedly to understand that the period of such restoration was far future. They inquired,—“Lord, wilt thou at this time restore the kingdom again to Israel?” There can be no doubt, I



think, that this question was put in view of the very prophecy I have taken for my text. All can see that it related to *time*. There could be no ground for mistake as to the *event*. Our Saviour, in his answer, confines himself to time. He gave them to understand that the event was certain. But it was not for them to know, then, the times and seasons which the Father had put in his own power. The event was far future, and there was no necessity of giving an immediate revelation concerning the time. But that they might be still farther assured as to the certainty of the predicted restoration, they were told by two heavenly messengers, that appeared as soon as the Lord had gone up beyond their sight, that the same Jesus who had gone up from them should so come in like manner as they had seen him go to heaven. All can see that this language expresses a personal coming in the strongest and most decisive manner. That is the coming intended by the prophecy, to restore the kingdom. The disciples wished to know if he would fulfil the prophecy, *at that time*, or *at that coming*, and he, in his answer, conveyed clearly the idea that the period was future that was assigned for its fulfilment, and not then to be known. But that they might not despair of its fulfilment, two angels are despatched, while the disciples are gazing towards heaven to catch another view of their ascending Lord, to assure them of his coming

again *in person*. This must have dispelled all doubt. Then, their faith in the restoration of the kingdom, and the *manner*, had a firm and immovable basis. It is therefore plain that the question of the disciples, and the answer of the Lord, together with the declaration of the angels, afford the clearest evidence that the prophecy relating to the kingdom is not to have its fulfilment until his future personal coming. To say the least, it shows that his first coming was not to receive the kingdom.

4. An additional proof of this is found in the fact that his first appearance was at the commencement of the supremacy of the fourth kingdom of Daniel's vision. That kingdom was one of the powers to be used in overturning and subverting the kingdom of Israel. It did destroy the last remnant of it. And it was to have an existence of two thousand years' duration. All this long space of time would be necessary for it to pass through all its predicted changes. After its fall and ruin, Christ was to receive the kingdom. See Daniel vii. 9—14. That kingdom, in its last predicted form, yet continues. Israel's power is yet scattered and broken. Jerusalem is yet trodden down by the Gentiles, because the times of the Gentiles still continue. David's throne is not to be re-established until those times expire. When Christ first appeared, the Roman monarchy had but just begun its long, bloody, and terrible career.

It was but in its infancy. It was for many long ages to break and scatter the power of Israel. Christ's first coming, then, was not the one pointed to by the prophecy.

5. The New Testament, with great uniformity, represents Christ as waiting *for*, and not as reigning *in*, his kingdom. The Father thus addressed him,—“Sit thou on my right hand, until I make thy foes thy footstool.” Ps. cx. 1. Acts ii. 34, 35. And Paul testifies, that he, after offering himself for sin, “sat down on the right hand of God; from henceforth EXPECTING *till his enemies be made his footstool.*” Heb. x. 12, 13. And this same apostle assures us, that, when he comes again, he will come *with his kingdom.* 2 Tim. iv. 1. Hence it is evident that he has not the kingdom which is his by right, and which he is to receive at his coming. It is not yet ready. The subjects are not all fitted, the territory is not yet prepared, the foes are not subdued, the dominion is yet in the hands of enemies. And his term of office as priest is not quite expired; he yet intercedes in heaven; yet presents his own blood before the Father as a reason for the delay of justice. But he will soon relinquish that position, and take to himself his great power and reign. But, since he does not now reign in his kingdom, all must see that his first coming was not that referred to in the text.

These reasons, though but a few of those

that might be offered, must satisfy all reasonable persons that the prophecy used for the text, did not have its fulfilment at Christ's first coming. We must then look for another coming as the period of its fulfilment.

And the next point of inquiry relates to the character of that coming. *Was a spiritual or personal coming intended?* And it seems that little need be said on this point, after what has been advanced. The arguments just offered to prove the coming intended, must also prove that the coming would be personal. If there were two classes of prophecies relating to Messiah's coming, in different characters, for different purposes, and under different circumstances, as has been shown, and the first class of which were fulfilled by his personal advent; how can it be rational to maintain that the other class will have a fulfilment by any other than a personal coming? The events of the latter class can no more be accomplished without a personal manifestation, than those of the former. And to deny that the latter do not refer to a personal appearing, is to deny that the former do not. The prophecy teaches as plainly, and more frequently, that Christ is to come in majesty, to reign, as that he should come in the form of a servant, to suffer and die. And if a personal coming be not meant in the one case, it cannot, for the same reason, be so meant in the other. We must, to be consistent, deny that a coming

in person was intended in both, or in neither, of the cases. Which, as lovers of the Bible, should we do?

And the considerations, that the power of Israel is yet broken and scattered,—that the promise that he should come in like manner as he went to heaven, was made, by the angels, in connection with an inquiry respecting the time of the restoration of the kingdom to Israel—that Christ is to come to set up his kingdom at the conclusion of the reign of the Roman monarchy, which still continues—and that the New Testament representation is, that he is waiting *for*, and not reigning *in*, his kingdom—must go very far towards proving that the prophecy pointed to a personal coming.

Further, the idea of a *spiritual* coming of Christ, when an absolute coming is intended, has no foundation. A spiritual coming evidently supposes a spiritual absence, which is contrary to fact. Spiritually, the Lord Jesus has been with his saints from the beginning. He promised to be with his ministers to the end of the world. See Matt. xxviii. 20. In a similar manner is he with all his saints. John xiv. And since, in this sense, he is and has been with his people, and since in the prophecy an absolute coming to take the kingdom, is predicted, it is in the highest degree absurd to talk of a spiritual coming. This all must see and admit.

Another consideration will place this matter

in a still stronger light. The part of the prophecy that has received its fulfilment, has had an exact literal fulfilment. The crown was *literally* taken away, the kingdom *literally* overturned and subverted, and *literally*, for ages, it has not been. Why, then, let me inquire, should we expect the other part—by far the more important and interesting part—to have any other than a literal fulfilment? How, in reason, can we look for any other than a literal coming, for a literal personal reign? Can we believe that prophecy has such a mixed and confused character as this? Such a thought does violence to that portion of the Bible, violence to reason, and is fraught with scepticism.

Again—A passage in Peter's address, given in the temple, soon after Pentecost, must be deemed sufficient to settle this question. After turning their attention to the fearful nature of their guilt, he thus exhorts the Jews: "Repent ye therefore, and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out, when the times of refreshing shall come from the presence of the Lord." To encourage them, and to correct their ideas of the order of events, he immediately adds: "And he shall send Jesus Christ, who before was preached unto you; whom the heaven must receive until the times of restitution of all things, which God hath spoken by the mouth of all his holy prophets since the world began." Acts. iii. 19—21. Three things, in the light of this pas-

sage, must be plain. 1. That if all things, spoken by God through the prophets, are to be restored, the kingdom of Israel is one of them. 2. That the restoration of this and the other things, is to be effected by sending Jesus Christ. 3. That, until the time of this restoration, the heaven is to receive him. If this language does not prove, beyond all dispute, a personal coming, for the restoration of the kingdom of Israel, it is not in the power of language to do it. And if it does not, with equal conclusiveness, prove that he did not come at the destruction of Jerusalem, or at any other period since, we should despair of seeing anything proved by the most direct testimony. The heaven was to receive him *until* the times of restitution, and no longer. Has he ceased to be a resident of heaven? There can be but one answer. And what has been restored of the "all things" spoken by the mouth of the prophets? *Nothing*. All is yet waste, and desolate, and in the hands of enemies. Christ, then, has not been sent; the heaven yet is his residence. But that same heaven that now entertains him, and is filled with his glory, is to yield him up, no more to receive him. For his tabernacle shall be with men, and he shall dwell with them, and they shall be his people, and he shall be with them and be their God and King.

We are, then, to expect that he will come personally, according to the import of the

prophecy, to take the kingdom of Israel, for so long a period broken and prostrate, and reign as a literal king. If he is to come personally, as has been fully demonstrated, all will allow that he is to have a personal reign.

But one other thought, contained in the text, will strengthen the argument. It is the *literal* kingdom that he is to receive, that is his by right, and which is to be no more until he comes. This being so, it would be the height of unreasonableness to suppose, that there would be any other than a literal and personal reign.

But there are additional proofs of the personal reign of Christ on earth.

2. *The concurrent testimony of Scripture is abundant and explicit, touching this point.* Only a few of the more direct and decisive passages can be cited in this discourse. "There shall come a star out of Jacob, and a sceptre shall rise out of Israel, and shall smite the corners of Moab, and destroy all the children of Sheth. Out of Jacob shall come he that shall have dominion, and shall destroy him that remaineth of the city." Numb. xxiv. 17, 19. "The adversaries of the Lord shall be broken to pieces; out of heaven shall he thunder upon them; the Lord shall judge the ends of the earth; and he shall give strength unto his King, and exalt the horn of his Anointed." 1 Sam. ii. 10. Though the heathen and the other wicked,



with their kings and rulers, combine to prevent his reign, it is said, in the second Psalm, "Yet have I set my king upon my holy hill of Zion." "He shall have dominion also from sea to sea, and from the river unto the ends of the earth." Ps. lxxii. 8. Zach. ix. 10. "Once have I sworn by my holiness that I will not lie unto David. His seed shall endure forever, and his throne as the sun before me. It shall be established forever as the moon, and as a faithful witness in heaven." Ps. lxxxix. 35—37. This is the same throne that was overthrown in the days of Zedekiah, and which was not to be re-established until Christ should come. "Then shall the moon be confounded, and the sun ashamed, *when the Lord of hosts shall reign in mount Zion, and in Jerusalem*, and before his ancients gloriously." Isa. xxiv. 23. "For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given, and the government shall be upon his shoulder; and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, The mighty God, The everlasting Father, The Prince of Peace. Of the increase of his government and peace, there shall be no end, UPON THE THRONE OF DAVID, AND UPON HIS KINGDOM, to order it, and to establish it with judgment and with justice, from henceforth even forever. The zeal of the Lord of hosts will perform this." Isa. ix. 6, 7. "And, behold, thou shalt conceive in thy womb, and bring forth a son, and shalt call his name Jesus. He shall be

great, and shall be called the Son of the Highest : AND THE LORD GOD SHALL GIVE UNTO HIM THE THRONE OF HIS FATHER DAVID : AND HE SHALL REIGN OVER THE HOUSE OF JACOB FOREVER ; and of his kingdom there shall be no end.” Luke i. 31—33. “I saw in the night visions, and, behold, one like the Son of man came with the clouds of heaven, and came to the Ancient of days, and they brought him near before him. And there was given him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all people, nations, and languages should serve him : his dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away, and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed.” Dan. vii. 13, 14. “And the seventh angel sounded ; and there were great voices in heaven, saying, The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord, and of his Christ ; and he shall reign forever and ever.” Rev. xi. 15. “Therefore, being a prophet, and knowing that God had sworn with an oath to him, (David,) that of the fruit of his loins, according to the flesh, HE WOULD RAISE UP CHRIST TO SIT ON HIS THRONE.” Acts ii. 30.

None can be so blind as not to see that *four* points, at least, are fully established by this testimony. 1. That Christ should reign. 2. That he should reign on the throne of David, in Mount Zion. 3. That his dominion should be over the whole earth. 4. That his kingdom shall be endless. These being settled, the notion of a spiritual reign must

be regarded as a delusion. A personal reign only can fulfil the prophetic representations and averments relating to his reign. To speak of his reigning spiritually on the throne of David, in Mount Zion, and exercising dominion over the whole earth, and at the same time to be in heaven in person, is to speak too absurdly to be heeded. The Scripture does not so use language, to confuse and mislead. And it seems that it need not be inquired, whether such a reign as the plain letter of the prophecy leads us to expect, has commenced? Facts teach us too plainly the contrary, to allow such an inquiry. All must know that it is far otherwise. But if there were a doubt as to this matter, a resort to the Bible would soon remove it. The present position of the Saviour in the universe, the office he now fills, and the position he is to occupy, are there clearly defined. One passage will impart much light on these points. "To him that overcometh, *will I grant to sit with me in my throne*, even as I also overcame, and *am set down with my Father* in his throne." Rev. iii. 21. He then is on his Father's throne; his own is in prospect. And this, with great uniformity, is the testimony of the whole New Testament. Peter quotes from Psalms to prove that he is at the right hand of God, waiting till his enemies be made his footstool. Acts ii. 34, 35. He says, Acts iii. 20, 21, that he is in heaven, to remain until the times of restitution. Stephen saw

him, just before his martyrdom, standing on the right hand of God. Acts vii. 55. Paul testifies, that, after God raised him from the dead, he "set him at his own right hand in the heavenly places, far above all principality, and power, and might, and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this world, but also in that which is to come, and hath put all things under his feet." Eph. i. 20—22. He says farther, Heb. x. 12, 13, that he is "on the right hand of God, from henceforth *expecting* till his enemies be made his footstool." And much of the argument, in the epistle to the Hebrews, goes to show that he is now officiating in the character of a priest. So it is most evident that he has not now his own kingdom; that he will not have it until the close of probation, as he is to officiate as priest until that time; and that he is now connected with his Father's kingdom. And, sustaining this connection with his Father's kingdom, it is plain to be seen what kingdom he is to give up, and what throne to abdicate, at his coming, according to 1 Cor. xv. 24. This passage has been a source of great perplexity to many minds, but this view makes it plain and intelligible. His own kingdom is not to be delivered up, because the prophecy declares that it shall be ETERNAL. God, in addressing the Son, thus declares the eternity of his throne: "Thy throne, O God, is forever and ever: a sceptre of righteousness is the sceptre of thy king-

dom." Heb. i. 8. The only kingdom, therefore, he can deliver up, or throne he can abdicate, is that of his Father, with which he is now connected.

If, then, as this testimony fully proves, the Messiah is now on his Father's throne—that his own is in prospect—that that is the throne of David in this world—that when it is re-established, the saints will be permitted to sit with him in it,—who can believe in any other than a personal reign? It is difficult to see who can.

3. Analogy furnishes a strong and unanswerable argument in favor of a personal reign. All the prophecies, relating to the Messiah, may properly be divided into three classes. These classes apply to his three offices, of Prophet, Priest, and King. These offices pertain to this world. The nature of them required that they should be sustained successively. They could not be held at one and the same time. The prophecies relating to the first two, have been literally fulfilled. There has not been, as it respects the prophetic and priestly offices, the slightest departure from the letter of the prediction. Christ has appeared, in conformity with the letter of prophecy, and for its fulfilment, as a literal prophet and priest. And does not analogy demand, strongly demand, that he shall come, as the plain language of the prophecy shows he will, as a literal King? A man would be held a strange

prophetical expositor, who should maintain a literal fulfilment in the first two cases, and a spiritual fulfilment in the last! This can find a parallel only in the popular view respecting the restoration of the Jews. It is held that the Jews are to be *literally* restored, and, at the same time, it is maintained that the kingdom of Israel is only to be *spiritually* restored! There is to be a literal restoration of the subjects, but only a spiritual restoration of the kingship! To such absurdities and inconsistencies do false rules of interpretation conduct us.

4. To commence a reign, presupposes that there was a time when it was not in being. The prophecies fix the period of Christ's reign, as has already appeared, at a point yet future. But he has all along reigned spiritually, as all admit: a spiritual reign, therefore, cannot be intended. All must see the force of this reasoning. If Christ has ever been reigning spiritually in the hearts of his people, and the prophecies all point to a future reign, as they evidently do, a different and more important reign must be expected; and what can that be but a personal reign?

5. His reign, in the Scriptures, is connected with events such as can take place only at his personal coming. These events are, the resurrection, judgment, destruction of the entire wicked, the conflagration of the world, and the new creation. All who believe in these events, believe they are to transpire

when Christ shall come personally. If, therefore, it can be made to appear that the commencement of his reign is associated with these events, it will become evident that it will begin at his personal coming; and must, consequently, be a personal reign. As this subject will come up again, under another head, I shall not here present but a passage or two showing this connection. And, since most believe that the events are so bound together as to occur at the same general period, if it can be shown that the reign of Christ is connected with any one or two of them, it will answer every purpose in this part of the discourse. Paul connects it with the judgment and resurrection, in his 2d epistle to Timothy. "I charge thee before God, and the Lord Jesus Christ, *who shall judge the quick and the dead at his appearing and his kingdom.*" 2 Tim. iv. 1. A connection is clearly shown in the Apocalypse. "And the seventh angel sounded; and there were great voices in heaven, saying, The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord, and of his Christ; and he shall reign forever and ever." And, at the same time, it is added by the elders in heaven,—“And the nations were angry, and thy wrath is come, and the time of the dead that they should be judged, and that thou shouldest give reward unto thy servants, the prophets, and to the saints, and them that fear thy name, small and great; and shouldest destroy them which

destroy the earth." Rev. xi. 15, 18. In this passage, the connection is very plain between the reign of Christ and the resurrection, the judgment, and the destruction of the wicked. From both texts, and others that will hereafter be introduced, it must be evident that Christ's coming to judgment is his coming to reign : if so, a personal reign, and no other, is to be looked for. We have, therefore, as solid a basis for the belief of a personal reign, as for a personal coming, or the events of the resurrection and judgment. To deny the one, is really to deny the other. The events are connected, and they must occur, or fail, together. If they fail, the hopes of the saints are fated to be wrecked and disappointed forever !

If time allowed, we might still fortify our position by referring to the faith, and hopes, and ardent anticipations of the pious world, from the earliest periods. We might allude to the belief and expectations of Abraham, Job, Daniel ; the united faith of the Jews ; the harmonious testimony of the early church ; the views of the Reformers ; the sentiments of the highest ornaments of the English pulpit ; the creeds of most of the sects ; and the songs that are chanted in almost every sanctuary. We might present the views of some of the most learned and pious divines of our own country ; and dwell upon the evidences that the notion of a spiritual reign is fast being abandoned in all



branches of the church. We might show that the doctrine of a spiritual reign was a legitimate offspring of papacy; that the popes concluded to let Christ reign spiritually if they might but reign personally; that they devised a plan of having a millennium without putting the Lord to any trouble about it;—and that just so far as the church, in any age, has acquired a standing, and influence, and honor in the world, has she lost sight of the great and precious doctrine of the personal reign of Christ. But I have not time to dwell on these points. It is not necessary. The Bible evidence is overwhelming. Christ shall come personally to take the kingdom, for to him, by right, it belongs.

“Come then, and, added to thy many crowns,  
 Receive yet one, the crown of all the earth,  
 Thou who alone art worthy! it was thine  
 By ancient covenant, ere nature’s birth,  
 And thou hast made it thine by purchase since,  
 And overpaid its value with thy blood.  
 Thy saints proclaim thee King; and in their hearts  
 Thy title is engraven with a pen  
 Dipt in the fountain of eternal love.  
 Thy saints proclaim thee King; and thy delay  
 Gives courage to their foes, who, could they see  
 The dawn of thy last advent, long desired,  
 Would creep into the bowels of the hills,  
 And flee for safety to the falling rocks.”

## II. THE IDENTITY OF THE MILLENNIUM WITH THAT REIGN.

The church has, in all time, been expecting, confidently expecting, a period of exalted

bliss, purity, and joy. For this expectation, the best of grounds can be shown. It was announced in Eden; promised to patriarchs; sung by holy bards of old; foretold by all the prophets; taught by the Saviour; proclaimed by the apostles; believed by all the faithful. The promise and the prospect of that state have cheered, encouraged, and nerved to nobler deeds, the saints in all ages. It was the favorite theme of prophets. Their clear and far-reaching vision was filled with the bright glories of that day of holy joy and triumph. The dawnings of that day, all have longed to see. Many a heart, in its fulness, has said,—

“Haste, then, and wheel away a shattered world,  
 Ye slow revolving seasons! We would see  
 (A sight to which our eyes are strangers yet)  
 A world that does not dread and hate his laws,  
 And suffer for its crime; would learn how fair  
 The creature is that God pronounces good;  
 How pleasant in itself, what pleases him.”

But, though the expectation of this state has been universal, the same place has not been assigned for it by all in the field of prophecy, nor the same views taken of its character. The period is believed in, but it is differently arranged in the order of future events. This different arrangement gives rise to the different views as to the character of the period. A portion of the church put the period *before*, and another portion *after*, the personal coming of Christ. If it is to be *before* such coming, it must be in a mortal state, comprising

more or less the evils of the curse; if after, it will be in the immortal state, entirely freed from those evils. The latter is our view. The former, all must allow, who have been at all familiar with the opinions of the church, to be quite a modern notion, especially among evangelical Christians. It cannot claim any respect on account of its antiquity. We will test it, and see what claims it has to regard and favor. The question, therefore, now is, whether the millennium is identified with the personal reign of Christ, or is to precede it?

And it does seem that the settlement of the question of a personal reign, must be deemed a settlement of this point. If Christ is to reign personally on earth, that, evidently, must be the millennium. Or is there to be a millennium, to be *succeeded* by a personal reign? This would be like having day before the appearing of the sun! like having the bloom and glory of spring amid the chills and frosts of winter! This is too absurd to be thought of. The whole question turns on the character of the anticipated reign. If that reign is to be personal, all must admit that there can be no millennium until its commencement. The Bible has so connected the two, in its plainest descriptions, as to leave no room for doubt. And as a personal reign has been proved, from the Scriptures, the point is, in fact, already established. But as other proofs may be furnished, proofs of a most decisive character, it may be proper to

present them, that the question may be placed beyond the limits of rational dispute.

1. The text itself, in the light of the explanation given, affords the strongest proof that there will be no millennium before the personal reign of Christ. The kingdom, whose destiny it pronounces, is to lie in ruins, until he comes to receive it. Surely, there will be no millennium until its restoration!

2. The connection in prophecy between that reign and the millennial state, must prove the identity of the two, beyond dispute. I need present but a passage or two to show this connection, since it can hardly be questioned, so often is it presented on the pages of prophecy. "In his days shall the righteous flourish; and abundance of peace so long as the moon endureth. He shall have dominion from sea to sea, and from the river unto the ends of the earth." Ps. lxxii. 8. After the destruction of the fourth kingdom of Daniel, it is said,—“And the kingdom and dominion, and the greatness of the kingdom under the whole heaven, shall be given to the people of the saints of the Most High, whose kingdom is an everlasting kingdom, and all dominions shall serve and obey him.” Dan. vii. 27. Previous to this possession of the kingdom, it is said that the saints are to be subject to, and oppressed by, earthly powers. So there can be no millennium till the time of possessing the kingdom. Zechariah thus shows the connection: “And the Lord shall

be king over all the earth ; in that day there shall be one Lord, and his name one. All the land shall be turned as a plain. And men shall dwell in it, and there shall be no more utter destruction, but Jerusalem shall be safely inhabited." Chap. xiv. 9—11. These passages show the general character of the prophecy, pertaining to the connection between Christ's reign and the millennial state. All must see their identity.

3. There can be no millennium antecedent to the personal reign of Christ, because the whole space of time to this period is given to earthly kingdoms. The little horn, the last form of the last kingdom, is to "make war with the saints and prevail against them, until the Ancient of days comes, and the time comes for the saints to possess the kingdom." See Daniel vii. This all must allow to be the same power as Paul's Man of Sin, that is to be destroyed by the brightness of Christ's coming. 2 Thess. ii. 8. Surely that millennium would not be of much worth, in which this little horn would be universally pushing, and over which would preside the Man of Sin ! I desire not such a state. But this power is to prevail and prosper, UNTIL the Ancient of days comes to destroy it. Prior to that, there can be no millennium.

4. The parable of the tares, as given by the Saviour, furnishes a strong argument in favor of our position. As we have the Lord's exposition of it, we can safely depend

upon it. The design of the parable obviously is, *to show the fact, and the reason of it, that the righteous and wicked are destined to dwell together until the close of probation.* “*Let both GROW TOGETHER until harvest; the harvest is the end of the world.*” At that time the separation will take place, and each class be conveyed to their respective places of reward. After that, the righteous are to shine forth as the sun in the kingdom of their Father. See Matt. xiii. 40—43. There is, then, no place for a millennium between the point of time at which the Lord uttered the parable, to the end of the world, or the time of harvest. During all that space, he has declared that the righteous and wicked shall flourish together in the same field.

5. The parable of the ten virgins furnishes evidence equally decisive in support of the view taken. This parable, without doubt, is intended to teach that the church, half of whom at least will possess no grace, will be in a state of spiritual sleep until the announcement is made, that the Bridegroom cometh. But who can believe that this will be the character of the inhabitants of the millennium! If Christ does not come until after the millennium, this must be their character! It will be a millennium, then, of spiritual sleepers, and graceless professors!

6. The duty to watch for his coming, so often enjoined, is inconsistent with the idea of a millennium before Christ's coming to reign.

For a thousand years, there could be no watching, either for the signs, or the event itself. There will be no ground to expect a sudden or unexpected manifestation of the Saviour, in that period.

7. A millennium to precede the personal reign of Christ, would be in a state of trial without the essentials of such a state. A state of trial is a state in which moral character is formed, and destiny is chosen. Among the essentials of such a state, are, freedom, temptation to wrong, inducement to right, or counter moral influences. Without these, it would be difficult to conceive of a state of trial. In the millennial state these can have no place, or at least some of them. There will there be no Satan to tempt, no world to overcome, no carnal nature to subdue, no wicked to annoy, no adverse influences to oppose, no sinful examples to influence, no trials to perplex, and no dangers to gather upon the path. All, all, in that state will be on the side of virtue, religion, and the highest enjoyment. Such a state cannot comprise the essentials of a state of probation. And yet it must be so, if it is before the coming of Christ. This must show the absurdity of such a view.

8. It is highly absurd to expect such a state as the Bible describes the millennium to be, in the earth, under the curse, with all incident to it. A quotation or two will show this. I will quote from the *millennial chapter*, the sixtieth

of Isaiah. "Violence shall no more be heard in thy land, wasting nor destruction within thy borders; but thou shalt call thy walls Salvation and thy gates Praise. The sun shall be no more thy light by day; neither for brightness shall the moon give light unto thee; but the Lord shall be unto thee an everlasting light, and thy God thy glory; thy sun shall no more go down; neither shall thy moon withdraw itself; for the Lord shall be thine everlasting light, and the days of thy mourning shall be ended. Thy people also shall be all righteous: they shall inherit the land forever, the branch of my planting, the work of my hands, that I may be glorified." This is almost precisely the same language that is employed in the twenty-first of Revelation, to describe what is conceded to be the immortal state. So similar is the language, that we cannot avoid the conclusion that it was borrowed from Isaiah. The same state must be referred to by both. It must be plain to all that Isaiah's language cannot be applied to the earth, in its present disordered and wretched state. If all violence, wasting, and destruction are to cease; if all mourning and sorrow are to have an end; if the sun and moon will no more be needed, on account of God's presence and glory; and if all are to be righteous and inherit the land forever; it cannot be in this world, under the curse, or even in a mortal state. We must rather look for it in the immortal state, under the reign of Christ.



9. The millennium is to be in the New Earth, and therefore will be identical with the reign of Christ. The Bible becomes more and more clear and definite in its instructions, as it advances towards its completion. The New Testament throws much light upon, and gives proper order to, the events predicted in the Old. Peter, in treating, in his last epistle, on the coming of Christ, and the events to succeed, has given us the order in which some of the more important prophetic events are to take place. After speaking of the conflagration of the present heavens and earth, he says,—“Nevertheless, we, according to his promise, look for new heavens and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness.” 2 Peter iii. 13. There is but one promise of this kind in the whole Bible, and that is found in Isaiah. John, the Revelator, *saw* a new heaven and new earth; but this was after the epistle of Peter was written. The promise in Isaiah, then, must be the one intended by Peter. And if so, we have a strong argument against a millennium in a mortal state. The promise in Isaiah is connected with a glowing description of the millennium; but Peter makes the period of its fulfilment *after* the conflagration of the present heavens and earth: the millennium connected with it, or dependent upon it, must, therefore, be after. And this will fix it in the new earth. And Peter suggests the reason why we are not to expect such a state

until the new creation, "wherein dwelleth righteousness." As if he had said, that cannot be expected in the present world. Why, then, not believe that he has given the prophetic events their true order? Why expect that here, which God has not promised; which cannot be?

10. A millennium before the resurrection, would exclude those from it who have the strongest claims to its enjoyment. Who should share in the bliss, and joy, and triumph of that state, if not Abraham, Moses, David, Daniel, Paul, the martyrs, those who have suffered and sacrificed the most for truth and Christ? How marvellous, that those should have an exclusive right to that season of rejoicing and holy triumph, who shall come on to the stage just at the dawn of that day, without having suffered anything, sacrificed anything, or done anything for Christianity? And, stranger still, that they should have a thousand years' jubilee over the graves of patriarchs, prophets, apostles, and martyrs! I cannot admit such a thought. It is inconsistent, irrational, absurd, and even revolting. Let the thought utterly perish! God's ways are not thus unequal. So far from this being true, it is expressly declared, that such shall have "*part in the first resurrection, and reign with Christ a thousand years.*" Rev. xx. 4. This clearly identifies the reign of Christ with the millennium.

11. The voice of the Christian church is

in favor of the identity of the millennium with the personal reign of Christ. To introduce any considerable part of the testimony that is at hand in proof of this, is not possible in this discourse. I can only present a few passages from the writings of different authors, which will exhibit the sentiments of the whole. Justyn Martyr, who flourished about thirty years after the death of the apostle John, thus testifies: "I, and as many as are orthodox Christians in all respects, do acknowledge, that there shall be a resurrection of the flesh, and a thousand years in Jerusalem, rebuilt, and adorned, and enlarged, as the prophets Ezekiel and Isaiah and others, attest!"—[Dialogue with Trypho, a Jew.]—The testimony of Irenæus is equally full and explicit with that of Justyn. He succeeded Pothinus as Bishop of Lyons, about A. D. 171, and was martyred in A. D. 202 or 208. He wrote, among other works, five books upon the *Heresies* of his times, which books are still extant. He speaks of St. John, the apostle, as having lived to the times of Trajan, of Polycarp, as a hearer of St. John, and of himself as a hearer of Polycarp. "For it is fitting that the just, rising at the appearing of God, should in the renewed state receive the promise of inheritance which God *covenanted to the fathers*, and should *reign* in it; and that then should come the final judgment. For in the same condition in which

they have labored and been afflicted, and been tried by suffering in all sorts of ways, it is but just that in it they should receive the fruits of their suffering; so that where, for the love of God, they suffered death, there they should be brought to life again; and where they endured bondage, there also they should reign. For God is rich in all things, and all things are of him; and therefore I say it is becoming, that the creature being restored to its original beauty, should, without any impediment or drawback, be subject to the righteous. This the apostle makes manifest in the epistle to the Romans: 'For the expectation of the creature waiteth for the manifestation of the sons of God, &c. For the creature itself also shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God.' The promise likewise of God *which he made to Abraham* decidedly confirms this; for he says, 'Lift up now thine eyes, and look from the place where thou art, northward, and southward, and eastward, and westward; for all the land which thou seest, to thee will I give it, and to thy seed forever.' Gen. xiii. 14, 15. And again, 'Arise, walk through the land in the length of it, and in the breadth of it, for I will give it unto *thee*.' Ver. 17. For Abraham received no inheritance in it,—not even a foot-breadth, but always was a stranger and a sojourner in it. And when Sarah, his wife, died, and the children of

Heth offered to *give* him a piece of land for a burial place, *he would not accept it*, but purchased it, for four hundred pieces of silver, from Ephron, the son of Zohar the Hittite; staying himself on the promise of God, and being unwilling to seem to accept from man what God had promised to *give* him, saying to him, 'To thy seed will I give this land, from the great river of Egypt to the great river Euphrates.' Thus, therefore, as God promised to him the inheritance of the earth, and he received it not during the whole time he lived in it, it is necessary that he should receive it, together with his seed, that is, with such of them as fear God, and believe in him—in *the resurrection of the just*." Irenæus then goes on to show that Christ and the church are also of the true seed, and partakers of the promises, and concludes the chapter as follows: "Thus, therefore, those who are of faith are blessed with faithful Abraham; and the same are the *children* of Abraham. For God repeatedly promised the inheritance of the land to Abraham and his seed; and as neither Abraham nor his seed—that is, not those who are justified by faith—have enjoyed any inheritance in it, *they will undoubtedly receive it at the resurrection of the just*. For true and unchangeable is God: wherefore, also, he said, 'Blessed are the meek, for they shall inherit the earth.' " \*

\* Literalist, vol. IV., pp. 39—41.

The Nicene Council, convened in the year 325, composed of three hundred and eighteen Bishops, and representing the whole Christian church, put forth the following as an article of their faith: "The world was made inferior because of fore-knowledge: for God fore-knew that man would sin. Therefore, we expect *New Heavens* and a *New Earth*, according to the holy Scriptures; the Epiphany and kingdom of the Great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ, being then manifested to us. And as Daniel says, the saints of the Most High shall take the kingdom. And the earth shall be pure and holy,—the land of the living and not of the dead."

As holding these views, we might give a list of such venerable names as Barnabas, Papias, Polycarp, St. Clement of Rome, Ignatius, Clement of Alexandria, St. Cyprian, St. Cyril, Tertullian, Methodius, Epiphanius, and many others in the early church; and, in the reformed church, such as Luther, Calvin, Tyndel, Mede, Bunyan, Dr. Gill, Sir Isaac Newton, Thomas Newton, Toplady, Wesley, Fletcher, Pirie, Cunninghame, Way, Hugh M'Neile, Croly, Burnet, and a host of others, that time would fail to mention. In fact, a careful examination of the views of the church since the apostles, must result in the conviction that the personal reign of Christ and the millennium were held to be identical, with great unanimity. Those views have not always been free from vagueness or grossness, but in the

main they have accorded with the views here advanced. We may safely say, that the church, in her purest and best days, has cherished no other views, nor has she had any other expectation. The purer she has been, the freer from ambition for worldly distinction, honor, and applause, the less lustful for secular power and control; the more clear, strong, and decisive has been her testimony on this subject. And having the plainest and most direct declarations of Scripture, and the voice of the church with us, what additional testimony is needed? We shall seek for no other. We consider that the doctrine of the identity of the personal reign and the millenium is based on so immovable a basis as not to be shaken. It will stand when the modern dream of a spiritual millennial reign shall pass away and be forgotten.

---

“So shall the world go on,  
 To good malignant, to bad men benign,  
 Under her own weight groaning; till the day  
 Appear of respiration to the just  
 And vengeance to the wicked; at return  
 Of him—thy Saviour and thy Lord;  
 Last in the clouds from heaven, to be revealed  
 In glory of the Father, to dissolve  
*Satan*, with his perverted world; then raise  
 From the conflagrant mass, purged and refined,  
 New heavens, new earth, ages of endless date,  
 Founded in righteousness, and peace and love,  
 To bring forth fruits, joy and eternal bliss.”

MILTON.

### III. THE PREPARATORY EVENTS OF THAT REIGN.

These events have been more than hinted

at in the previous remarks. They cannot well be mistaken in the light of the personal reign of Christ. If he is to reign personally, he is to come personally; and, therefore, the events connected in Scripture with his coming, must be preparatory to his reign. And none can be mistaken as to these events. Those who believe in a personal coming, cannot be slow to believe that all the events associated in the Bible with that coming, will then take place. The Bible does not encourage us to expect but one more coming. It shows what will then take place. If, therefore, that last and final coming be to reign, all that will then occur will be preparatory to that reign. Having already proved, as we think satisfactorily, that the coming to be expected is to introduce a personal and endless reign, we need do little more than specify these events.

And one of these surely cannot be the restoration of the natural Jews. This is a favorite idea, a brilliant fancy, with many in these days. But the notion is too gross, too low, too repugnant to the Christian scheme, too contrary to the genius of the gospel, and too sensual in its tendency, to be regarded with favor by those whose vision of the true reign of the Messiah is clear and unclouded. The limits of this discourse will not admit of anything like an extended discussion of this subject. A passage or two, directly in point, must suffice. The prophecy constituting the text affords the most indisputable



proof that there can be no restoration of the natural Jews *before* the coming of Christ. Their kingdom is to remain broken and prostrate until that time. There can, then, be no restoration in advance of that period. This is settled. And the apostle Peter, in addressing the Jews, a few days after Pentecost, presents to them the condition upon which they shall be entitled to share in the restoration when Christ comes. "Repent ye therefore, and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out, when the times of refreshing shall come from the presence of the Lord; and he shall send Jesus Christ, who before was preached unto you: whom the heavens must receive until the times of restitution of all things, which God hath spoken by the mouth of all his holy prophets since the world began." Acts iii. 19—21. Here we have the promise that Christ shall come to effect the restoration of the things spoken by the prophets, among which is the kingdom of Israel; and the condition upon which the Jews can share in it. The condition is *repentance*, not *at*, but *before*, the coming of Christ. When he comes he is to take "vengeance on them *that know not God*, and *that obey not the gospel*." 2 Thess. i. 8. All unbelieving Jews, at his coming, will be of the latter class: they will not obey the gospel, the first precept of which requires faith in Christ. So it is plain, from the two scriptures, that the natural Jews are not to

be restored *before*, or *after*, the coming of Christ. The kingdom to be restored, will be a holy kingdom, and none but holy persons will be subjects of it. All readers of the Bible should carefully distinguish between the *conditional* promises made to the *natural*, and the *unconditional* promises made to the *spiritual* Israel. For want of this distinction, many have erred, and persist in their error.

The destruction, and not the conversion of the wicked of the world, will be preparatory to that reign. This must follow as a certain consequence from a personal coming of Christ. That coming is everywhere represented, in the Scripture, as intended to close probation, and seal the fate of the world. It will be a judicial, and not a merciful coming—a coming as a Judge, and not as a Saviour—a coming in robes of vengeance, and not in those of salvation—a coming to destroy, and not to save the wicked. This is the uniform representation of Scripture. But we have express and multiplied declarations on the inspired pages, that, as preparatory to the reign of Christ, the wicked shall be destroyed. We can cite but few of these. “There shall come a star out of Jacob, and a sceptre shall rise out of Israel, and shall smite the corners of Moab, and destroy all the children of Sheth. Out of Jacob shall come he that shall have dominion, and shall destroy him that remaineth of the city.”

Soon after, it is added by the prophet,—  
 “Alas, who shall live when God doeth this!”  
 Numbers xxiv. 17, 19, 23. “Yet have I set  
 my king upon my holy hill of Zion.” [This  
 God says he will do, though the heathen and  
 people, with their kings and rulers, conspire  
 together to prevent it.] “Ask of me, and I  
 shall give thee the heathen for thine inheri-  
 tance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for  
 thy possession” [all that oppose his reign.]  
 “*Thou shalt break them with a rod of iron;  
 thou shalt dash them in pieces like a potter’s  
 vessel.*” Ps. ii. 6, 8, 9. “And it shall come to  
 pass in that day, that the Lord shall punish  
 the host of the high ones that are on high,  
 and the kings of the earth upon the earth.  
 And they shall be gathered together as pris-  
 oners are gathered in the pit, and shall be  
 shut up in the prison, and after many days  
 shall they be visited. Then the moon shall  
 be confounded, and the sun ashamed, when  
 the Lord of hosts shall reign in mount Zion,  
 and in Jerusalem, and before his ancients  
 gloriously.” Isaiah xxiv. 21—23. Christ  
 says, when he returns with the kingdom, he  
 will thus command respecting the opposers of  
 his reign,—“But those mine enemies which  
 would not that I should reign over them,  
 bring hither and slay them before me.”  
 Luke xix. 27. At the sounding of the sev-  
 enth trumpet, when the reign of Christ is in-  
 troduced, it is exclaimed by the elders in  
 heaven,—“And the nations were angry, and

thy wrath is come, and the time of the dead that they should be judged, \* \* \* *and that thou shouldest destroy them that destroy the earth.*" These texts, though a few of many touching this point, prove beyond all doubt that the overthrow and destruction of the enemies of God will be preparatory to the reign of Christ. I am aware that multitudes of good and benevolent Christians are hoping better things for the world; are hoping that the promised reign will be preceded by the conversion, and not the destruction of the world. This is a good hope in itself, but what is its foundation? What promise, what prophecy, what signs, what prospects justify it? Has God so spoken?—do the tendencies of things favor it?—do his providences indicate it? Look at the world at this advanced period—in this age of moral and religious enterprise—of high zeal and glowing hope of success—this age of light and truth, and great moral and religious tendencies—and what is there to encourage? What advances upon Satan's territory are made? What conquests achieved? Is it not a mournful fact, that, with all these advantages, the church does not keep pace, in her progress, with the increase of the world's population? No wonder that a minister of this city, in a recent missionary discourse, was constrained to say, "that, at this rate, it would take ages on ages to convert the world."\* But

\* The Rev. Mr. Anderson.

what prospect of a better rate? God has not promised it, but predicted the reverse. The world will wax worse and worse till Christ come to reign. He will find it as it was in the days of Noah and Lot. Then those shall be destroyed that destroy the earth.

Another event will be, the resurrection of all who have died in faith, from the beginning of time. This event, also, as all must allow, is, in Scripture, connected with the personal coming. See 1 Cor. xv. 22, 23. 1 Thess. iv. 14—17. And in prophecy it is connected with Christ's reign. In Ezekiel xxxvii. 12, 13, it is said,—“Behold, O my people, I will open your graves, and cause you to come up out of your graves, and bring you into the land of Israel. And ye shall know that I am the Lord, when I have opened your graves, O my people, and brought you up out of your graves.” It is added, Jer. xxiv. 27, “And David my servant shall be king over them; and they shall have one Shepherd: they also shall walk in my judgments, and observe my statutes and do them. My tabernacle shall also be with them; yea, I will be their God, and they shall be my people.” This cannot take place before Christ comes; for, 1. There is to be no restoration until that time. 2. By David, here, all understand Christ to be intended. 3. The tabernacle of God is not to be with men, until the new earth is created. See Rev. xxi. 3. The language, then, must

denote a *literal* resurrection. When Michael (who is Christ) stands up to reign, according to Daniel xii. 1, 2, the resurrection is to occur. "And many that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt." Here, as in many cases in prophecy, two events, though to occur at different periods, are grouped together as though really connected. Subsequent revelations show their order as to time. Though this may be disputed, one thing must be clear, and that is all that is material in this case, that when Christ stands up to reign, the resurrection will take place. This the prophecy so declares. One other quotation must close the proof of this point. "And I saw thrones, and they sat upon them, and judgment was given unto them: and I saw the souls of them that were beheaded for the witness of Jesus and for the word of God, and which had not worshipped the beast, neither his image, neither had received his mark upon their foreheads, or in their hands, and they lived and reigned with Christ a thousand years. But the rest of the dead lived not again until the thousand years were finished. This is the first resurrection. Blessed and holy is he that hath part in the first resurrection; on such the second death hath no power, but they shall be priests of God and of Christ, and shall reign with him a thousand years." Rev. xx. 4—6. No lan-

guage could teach more plainly than this does, that the resurrection of the righteous dead will be preparatory to the reign of Christ. I am aware, that, to avoid our conclusion, this has been called a spiritual resurrection. To say nothing of the absurdity of such a view, let me inquire where the consistency is, in our opponents' explaining this language to mean a *spiritual* resurrection, and that used in the same chapter respecting the judgment, to mean a *literal* judgment? Why not both spiritual, if either? But we regard both as literal, and so, with great unanimity, have the whole church.

The last event to be considered, as preparatory to the expected reign, is the renewal of the earth and heavens. This clearly follows from previous positions. It is an event that is associated with the coming of Christ, and clearly implied in the resurrection. But positive proof is at hand. In connection with a description of the promised reign, and as preparatory to it, it is declared by Isaiah,—“The earth is utterly broken down, the earth is clean dissolved, the earth is moved exceedingly. The earth shall reel to and fro like a drunkard, and shall be removed like a cottage; and the transgression thereof shall be heavy upon it: and it shall fall and not rise again.” Isa. xxiv. 19, 20. “For, behold, I create new heavens, and a new earth; and the former shall not be remembered, nor come into mind.” Isa. lv.

17. The apostle Peter, as we have seen in another place, fixes the period of the fulfilment of this promise at the coming of Christ, and after the conflagration of the present heavens and earth. 2 Peter iii. 10—13. As his reign does not begin till his coming, it must be a preparatory event to it. And the Saviour has instructed us about the state and place of his reign, in Matt. xix. 28. "And Jesus said unto them, Verily I say unto you, that ye which have followed me, IN THE REGENERATION, when the Son of man shall sit in the throne of his glory, ye also shall sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel." His reign, then, is to be in the regeneration, or new earth. That promised earth is subjected to him. Heb. ii. 5. In it, with all the redeemed, will he reign forever and ever.

These are the more important events that are to precede, and prepare for, that reign. And are they not now upon us?

#### IV. THE PRIVILEGES AND ENJOYMENTS OF THAT REIGN.

As to these, who can adequately speak—who can properly conceive? It is much easier to tell what will *not* be there, than what *will*. So the Bible shows. Its descriptions of that state are mostly negative. When it touches positives, it has to be general. Little, then, can I say about its privileges and enjoyments. Only faint ideas can



be had. And I wish first to observe, that, to have any idea of that state, approaching to correctness, the hearer should associate with it, in his mind, all that he has ever conceived that was beautiful, lovely, blissful, and glorious in the heavenly state. *That will be the saints' heaven!* All the beauty, glory, and joy, you ever thought of in connection with heaven, and much more, will centre there. The new earth will bloom with far more than its original freshness and loveliness. It will rise, purged and refined, from the conflagrant mass. It will be a world of immortality. The ills of a mortal sinful state shall be unknown there. All its inhabitants shall be like the angels, being children of the resurrection. "But they that shall be accounted worthy to obtain that world (the new earth) and the resurrection from the dead, neither marry, nor are given in marriage: neither can they die any more; for they are equal unto the angels; and are the children of God, being the children of the resurrection." Luke xx. 35, 36. Death shall have no place there—disease shall not riot there—pain shall not afflict there—separation shall not be known there—nor sorrow felt there. No tears shall fall there—no wants pinch there—no trials annoy there. In that world, there shall be no Satan to tempt—no wicked to molest—no fallen flesh to seduce. There, friends shall greet each other—there, the saints of all ages and climes, shall be brought

into holy familiarity and perfect communion. There shall be the New Jerusalem, shining in its refulgent glory, and there the throne of God and the Lamb. And there shall be the river of life—the tree of life, with its monthly fruits, to heal the nations. There, in short, WILL BE HEAVEN!

“Behold the measure of the promise filled;  
 See Salem built, the labor of a God!  
 Bright as a sun the sacred city shines.  
 All kingdoms, and all princes of the earth  
 Flock to that light; the glory of all lands  
 Flows into her; unbounded is her joy,  
 And endless her increase——  
 Praise is in all her gates. Upon her walls,  
 And in her streets, and in her spacious courts,  
 Is heard salvation. \* \* \*  
 \* \* \* Her report has travelled forth  
 Into all lands. From every clime they come  
 To see thy beauty, and to share thy joy,  
 Oh Zion! An assembly such as earth  
 Saw never, such as heaven stoops down to see!”

## V. THE EVIDENCES THAT THAT REIGN IS ABOUT TO BEGIN.

We now come to the feature of the system the most serious and difficult,—the feature the most opposed. It may justly be called the *offensive* point. For our views of time, though candidly and honestly cherished, and, in most cases, modestly put forth, we have suffered all kinds of reproach, and have been most unscrupulously traduced and misrepresented. All sorts of objections are made to them. Our attention is frequently turned, by

our opposers, to the fearful results and tremendous evils of the system, if it shall, as they are confident it will, prove untrue. We are everywhere, and by almost all, assured, that the certain result will be a great increase of ungodliness, and a vast multiplication of sceptics. So common is the charge that we are making infidels, that it has come to be regarded as so evident as to need no proof. The charge comes from the pulpit, the press,—from the professor's chair, the clerical council, the church-member,—from the pious and profane. All have heard it,—all repeat it. It is the short argument, the all-powerful weapon against the system. It is deemed sufficient to set aside all reasoning, however clear, logical or cogent; to disprove all proofs, however direct or demonstrative; to annihilate all facts, however generally acknowledged or well attested; and to strip the most remarkable and ominous signs now developing, of all their significance and import. We may cite, in proof of our views, and in justification of our hopes, the prophets of the Old and New Testaments; the fathers of the church and of the Reformation; the Protestant expositors of the Old and New World; and the extraordinary signs that mark and identify the present period—but to no purpose. “It will make infidels,” is the ready and sufficient answer. Assuming that the system is false, and that consequently it will fail; and assuming that its failure will greatly

increase the number of errorists, they deem themselves justified in using all sorts of methods in opposing it. It would seem that the popish principle, *that the end sanctifies the means*, has come to be looked upon as a true principle of Christian action. Learning, wit, authority, traduction, misrepresentation, and ridicule, have done their utmost. From the theological professor and highest church dignitary, down to the obscurest country preacher, the system has had to suffer an exposure and overthrow. But it behooves all to look well to the grounds on which, and the means by which, the doctrine has been sought to be put down. The principles arrayed against the system, though hastily put forth, and advocated, to meet a specific form of alleged error, are not to be forgotten or cease to have an existence when the system shall have its catastrophe, as it is said it will shortly have. Those principles, on the supposition that we fail, will work an important revolution in the religious and theological views, hopes, encouragements and prospects of the church. Indeed, a new era has already commenced in prophetic exposition and biblical interpretation. Old and long-settled principles have been abandoned; the most undisputed and generally received views have been relinquished; and new views and principles hastily adopted, and urged with all the zeal and vehemence which a high determination to accomplish an end alone could

supply. In fact, in many cases, positions of great and vital importance in sentiment, have been changed,—so that the opposers of this system find themselves in sweet and delightful fellowship and in the most cordial coöperation with those whom, heretofore, they have regarded as the most dangerous and hurtful errorists. And hence it behooves all to open their eyes, and see who are making the infidels. And more especially should they do it as they are confident that we shall fail, and time will continue, and that existing causes will continue to operate to make error as destructive of the souls of men as it has always been. If our system prove true, the errors opposed to it will soon cease to injure and ruin. All the evil they will do, will be confined to those who now cherish and practise them. If the Lord shall soon come, their evil influence can be but a little longer felt. He will cut it short abruptly. But not so, on the other hypothesis. The systems now advocated, the theories now advanced, will continue to mould the sentiments, and shape the practice, and decide the doom of millions, while time lasts. If the errors would cease when the hated system should receive by time its explosion, as such predict it will, less caution would be necessary. But so they will not.

I shall now present a brief statement of facts and evidences, to show that we are sustained in our views on this subject, by the

plain teaching of the Scriptures, and the first and most judicious expositors of the church; and also to show that our leading opponents disregard that teaching, turn their backs on their expositors, and take positions favoring the three great errors—*Infidelity, Romanism, and Universalism*.

And I need only to allude to the views of but one of our opponents, as he has given character, shape and tone to the opposition. I refer to Professor Stuart, of Andover. The views thrown out in his "Hints," are, in different forms, the only ones opposed to us with any success. He, in the main, represents the whole host of the opposition. To present his views, therefore, will, in the main, be furnishing those of the whole class.

I have read the book of the Professor with much care and attention. I read it both *before* and *since* I embraced the doctrine of the Lord's speedy coming. The author's standing, the subject, a desire to furnish myself with something adequate to arrest the progress of the Second Advent heresy, prompted me to a first perusal. I have read it since, that I might be the more certain of the correctness of the impressions first produced. I had long desired Stuart to speak. I had seen, with mortification, the utter futility and puerility of the attempts of others to put down the views. Dowling had written *speciously*, yet *unfairly*, and therefore without great effect; Smith had

written *sneeringly*; Cambell *feebly*; Bush *paradoxically*; the Universalists *bitterly*; all *ineffectually*. From Stuart, a different work was expected; a work characterized with such coolness and cogency of reasoning, with such biblical and historical research, such ability and learning in prophetic exposition, as to carry conviction to all who could be affected by rational means. I remember I felt a secret delight when the work was put into my hands, believing, as I did, that it constituted the antidote desired. But how different my view, after a partial examination! It was, indeed, learned, cool, dignified in its style, and excellent in some of its parts; but its leading positions were so startling, so irrational, and so fraught with sceptical consequences, and its inconsistencies were so marked and glaring, that I closed the book with shame, mortification and disgust. Verily, I thought the wise had become mad. I had not a credulity that would admit of such a straining as would be necessary, to adopt such positions. And the thought of their being generally adopted, was truly alarming. I was bound to believe, from a knowledge of the circumstances, that Stuart had done his best. He had surveyed the whole field of prophetic interpretation; had an accurate knowledge of all the theories which had been advanced and advocated on the subject of prophecy; was aware of all the efforts that had been made to explode the system of Mr.

Miller; and had in his possession all the means which the learned world could furnish, for the construction of an exegetical work. Under such circumstances, with such means, and addressing himself to such a work, what should we expect of the ripest scholar of the age? We should dishonor the Professor to say, that he only intended to make a common effort. The time, the subject, the means, the man, *all uncommon*; and should we expect a hasty, unmatured, by-the-way sort of an effort? We should rather look for his ripest, best matured, and most fully-digested thoughts. Having the collected wisdom and knowledge of all that had written before him on the prophecies, and knowing the demands of the time, we should expect he would bring out the most able, plausible and tenable system of which he was capable. And that he has, every one may be assured. He has called to his aid all that could give him aid; and we have the results in his "Hints." And what are they? Truth, candor, and faithfulness demand that I say, a compound of *Papacy*, *Neology*, and *Universalism*. This will be shown, after we have given a synoptical view of the books of Daniel and John, the only calendars of the Christian.

The book of Daniel naturally divides itself in three parts,—historical, prophetical, and expository. Six of the chapters are properly history, three are prophecy, and three exposi-



tory. And, it should be added, that there is more or less history and exposition in all the prophetic chapters. This arrangement is made to give the main features of the several chapters. The second, seventh, and eighth chapters are prophetic, the ninth, eleventh, and twelfth are expository. The tenth I have classed with the historical chapters, and yet it does not strictly belong with them, as it is but a *preface* to the last two expository chapters. All must admit that the same space of time and events are covered by the exposition, which are covered by the prophecy. We only need, then, to inquire, how extensive the field embraced in the prophecy?

The prophecy claims to cover the whole field of the future. "*The great God hath made known to the king what shall come to pass hereafter : and the dream is certain, and the interpretation thereof sure.*" Dan. ii. 45. The method of making this known to the king is here stated. It was by a dream, in which he saw a metallic image, whose form was terrible,—the head of which was gold, his breast and arms of silver, his belly and thighs of brass, his legs of iron, and his feet part of iron and part of clay. He saw till a stone was cut out without hands, and smote the image upon his feet that were of iron and clay, and broke them to pieces; and then was the whole broken to pieces together, and became like the chaff of the summer threshing-floors, and the wind carried them away, and

there was no place found for them; and the stone that smote the image became a great mountain and filled the whole earth. Daniel, in his interpretation, tells Nebuchadnezzar that this was to show him the number, character, changes, and destiny of the universal kingdoms that should bear sway over the earth; and these should be five in number, four of them earthly and oppressive, represented by the image, to be succeeded by God's everlasting kingdom, symbolized by the stone. This covers the whole space of the future. Those kingdoms rising *successively*, and the earthly kingdoms extending in duration to a certain point, and then followed by the everlasting kingdom of God, would, as all can see, fill the whole field of the future. And we are not left in ignorance as to what kingdoms were represented by the image. The king is told by Daniel that the first is his kingdom, the *Babylonian*; the fifth chapter teaches us that this was succeeded by the *Medo-Persian*; the eighth, that this should be followed by the *Grecian*; the ninth speaks of the people of the prince that should come, and destroy the city and sanctuary,—evidently meaning the *Romans*. And history shows that these were the kingdoms meant.

In the seventh chapter, we are told that Daniel had a vision, in which he saw these same kingdoms, under the symbols of four wild beasts. And the last kingdom was followed by the coming of the Son of man in the

clouds of heaven, the judgment, and everlasting kingdom of God. But the instruction of this vision is more in detail, that one fact might be explained; viz., *the unusually long continuance of the fourth kingdom*. This is accounted for by showing that it would exist in two distinct forms, and pass through several changes. The terrible beast representing this kingdom, seen in the vision, first appears to the view of Daniel having ten horns. Then is seen a little horn coming up among them, and three of the first falling before it. And this horn had a look more stout than his fellows, had eyes as the eyes of a man, and a mouth that spake great words against the Most High, and wore out the saints of the Most High, and thought to change times and laws; and the saints were given into his hands for a time, times, and the dividing of a time; and he made war against them and prevailed against them, until the Ancient of days came, and the time came for the saints to possess the kingdom. We have here the same space of time covered as in Nebuchadnezzar's vision, with more particularity of description and detail. We have the four kingdoms, the fourth in its two forms, the judgment, the coming of the Son of man in the clouds of heaven, the giving of the body of the last beast to the burning flame, and the possession of the kingdom by the saints. And we have instruction as to the time of the dominion of the papal horn, as that is evidently the power

intended in the time, times and dividing of time, or one thousand two hundred and sixty years. But as that dominion was not to extend quite to the end, the chain was not long enough to measure the whole time. Another vision therefore was necessary.

This was had, as we are told in the eighth chapter. In this vision, there is no symbol for the first kingdom, as that was about to be superseded. The three succeeding are represented by a ram, goat, and a horn, little at its beginning, but waxing exceeding great toward the south, east, and pleasant land; and waxed great even to the host of heaven, and cast down some of the host and stars to the ground and stamped upon them; and magnified itself to the prince of the host, took away the daily sacrifice, and cast down the place of his sanctuary; and cast the truth to the ground, and practised and prospered. We have the highest authority for believing that this horn represents the Roman kingdom in its pagan and papal forms. The symmetry of the vision requires this; the prophetic description shows it. The length of the vision was asked by one, and given by another,—two thousand three hundred days. That was to be the end of indignation, or the termination of the reign of earthly powers. Then the sanctuary was to be cleansed, or, which is the same thing, the kingdom possessed by the saints. But more instruction as to this time, especially its commencement, was necessary.

And it was given at the very time when it was needed. Daniel, about the time of the expiration of the seventy years of captivity, began to pray, overlooking the vision of the two thousand three hundred days, for the same thing promised at the end of those days. Gabriel is despatched immediately, and told to fly swiftly, to correct the error of Daniel, and give him farther instruction as to the time appointed, especially its commencement. He turns his attention to the matter of prayer, and the vision of two thousand three hundred days. He divides the long period, and gives some of the more important events of a religious character that would occur, or those that would more particularly concern Daniel. He instructs him that seventy weeks, or four hundred and ninety years, are cut off for his people and city, to finish the transgression and make an end of sins, to make reconciliation for iniquity, and to bring in everlasting righteousness, and seal up the vision and prophecy, and anoint the Most Holy. He wishes him to be particular and understand when the period should begin, *at the going forth of the commandment to restore and build Jerusalem*. From that point, he assures him, unto Messiah the Prince, there should be sixty-nine weeks—four hundred and eighty-three years. After that he should be cut off, having confirmed the covenant with many for one week. Gabriel then carries his mind down to the destruction of Jerusalem, and

over a long period of desolation to the "consummation," when that which is determined shall be poured upon the desolator, or Roman power. So it is plain that the instruction of the ninth chapter covers the whole field of the prophecy. But it is confined to the religious events that were to transpire.

In the tenth chapter, he comes again, and announces his design, to make Daniel understand what shall befall his people in the latter days. Verse 14. He then begins with the power then reigning, and gives a detailed account of the successive reigns to the time the last power is broken without hand. Then, he says, Michael shall stand up to reign, and there shall be a time of trouble such as there never was since there was a nation to that time, but all shall be delivered who are found written in the book; the resurrection shall take place, and the wise shall shine as the brightness of the firmament, and those who have turned many to righteousness as the stars forever and ever. Daniel is then instructed to shut up and seal the book, until the time of the end. At that time, he is assured, the wise shall understand. But before the close of the chapter, he has two other numbers given him, to enable him to determine the rise as well as duration of the papal dominion, and the period when he shall stand in his lot in the kingdom promised. This brings us again to the end. So we are

carried over this same field three times in the prophecy, and twice in the exposition.

Taking this view of the prophecy, what a book does it become! Grasping a period so vast; stretching over limits so broad; fore-showing, with such accuracy and fulness of detail, the rise, order, character, and destiny of the mightiest kingdoms of earth; foretelling, with such exactness and precision, events so note-worthy and distinguishing as the first and second advent of the Messiah, and the periods and accompanying events of those advents, and then unfolding to view the immortal state—it becomes a book of the highest importance and interest. As a prophetic book, it is incomparable. It gives us an accurate account of the whole road and distance yet to be travelled, as well as those already passed over. It brings to view, and in their order, the great events of thousands of years! It stops not with the changes and events of time; it extends onward to eternity, and affords a view of the scenes of that world! This being the scope and field of the prophecy, its value and interest to the church cannot be estimated.

The Apocalypse, or Revelation, in its prophetic portion, embraces the period of the last or Roman kingdom, from the time John had his vision to the time of its destruction, and gives us, with more minuteness and detail than Daniel, the religious and political events to occur to the end; and it then furnishes us

with a most glowing description of the happy and blissful state succeeding the downfall of the last kingdom, the destruction of the wicked, the confinement of Satan, and the renewal of the earth and heavens. That this is the field it covers, the book itself will show. "Write the things which thou hast seen, and the things which are, AND THE THINGS WHICH SHALL BE HEREAFTER." Chap. i. 19. As the book has, then, properly three parts, the prophetic portion constitutes the *third part, being confined to the things that should be thereafter.* And, written as it was during the supremacy of the Roman kingdom, and under the first form of it, we should necessarily conclude that it would cover the whole time of its existence, and fill up the outlines furnished by the more comprehensive prophecy of Daniel, and give us more in detail respecting the manner of its destruction, and afford us a fuller and more definite view of the state and glory of the kingdom to follow. All of this it does. It takes us several times over the whole field, and gives us as many views of the different classes of events which were to take place during the period; presents the Roman kingdom in its two distinctive forms, with the proper numbers showing the limits of its duration; describes its rage, opposition, bloody persecution, and fearful destruction of the saints; and then shows the manner of its



overthrow, succeeded by a description of the glory that will follow.

Now all are ready to admit, that if this is a correct view of the field of prophecy, and the points and lengths of the prophetic numbers, there can be no mistake as to the legitimacy and correctness of our conclusions. But in all that is essential in the above view, we have with us the highest and most respected authorities of the whole church. In fact, in almost every point raised by our opponents, we have been supported by the expositors. In the very few instances in which we have not their direct support, we have their general views and reasonings to sustain us, and the direct testimony of some of the first and most judicious of their number. This I will proceed to show.

Seven points of doubt or dissent have been raised, in reference to the above view, by our opponents. These points I will specify. 1. The fourth kingdom of Daniel. 2. The little horn of the seventh chapter. 3. The little horn of the eighth. 4. The length of the prophetic periods. 5. The commencement of the seventy weeks. 6. The connection between the seventy weeks and 2300 days. 7. The rise of the little horn of the seventh. These, so far as I know, are the only points of doubt or dissent involved in the system we advocate. If we are sustained in these by the best and highest authorities of the religious world, all must see that the

system does not rest on slight or insufficient grounds. And, as it respects the first five points, it can hardly be questioned that we have nearly the whole Protestant world with us. An admission of Prof. Stuart implies as much as this. He admits that the custom of reckoning *days* as the representatives of *years*, among the interpreters of the old and new world, is *almost universal*. (*Hints*, p. 74.) This concession is valuable for more than one purpose. It may involve more than appears at first view. If the interpreters of the Protestant world are with us, *as to the method of computing prophetic time*, they are as to the leading features of the prophecy. This will follow as a matter of necessity. The question of the length of the prophetic numbers must depend in a great measure on the extent of the prophetic field, or the character and importance of prophetic events. If, for instance, the little horn of the seventh of Daniel be intended to represent Papacy, and not Antiochus, the time, times, and the dividing of time, or 1260 days, the period during which the saints were to be in his hands, cannot mean so many literal days, but so many years. This all will admit. So of the little horn of the eighth. If Rome in its compound pagan and papal form, be meant, and not Antiochus, the 2300 days, all will admit, must mean so many years. So the question as to the length of the prophetic numbers, is one of fundamental importance in the system

of interpretation. It has a vast bearing upon the character, and import, and importance of prophecy. The literal system of interpreting these numbers, or the system that teaches that a *day in prophecy means but a day*, changes the whole character of prophecy, and diminishes it in importance, value, dignity, and extent of scope, just as much as the difference between 2300 literal days and the same number of years! To shorten the prophetic numbers, the prophecy needs to be correspondingly cut down! The field is reduced, to answer to the chain that is to measure it! This is the alarming result of the new system of interpretation. The whole is a paring, frittering, reducing process. It strips the prophecy of its dignity, solemnity, importance, and glory. It leaves it valueless—as empty as a sound. These *day expositors* can see nothing beyond a day—the events they interpret are all of a day! The measure of the importance of prophecy is the measure of a man, that is, of Antiochus! The question, then, respecting the length of prophetic time, is one of great moment. Much hangs upon its decision. And yet a decision of this question must involve a decision as to the extent of the field covered by the prophecy. They are of necessity dependent on each other. And, of consequence, those who are with us as to the length of prophetic time, are with us as to the general field embraced in the prophecy. It is true,

that, among such, there is a difference as to the application of some particular parts of the prophecy, but not as to the extent of field it covers. Some of the old writers applied the prophecy relating to the little horn of the seventh and eighth of Daniel, to Antiochus, but only in the sense of a *type* of the Antichrist to come. This, though a mistaken application, did not affect their views as to the field embraced in the prophecy, or the length of the prophetic numbers.

Now, as we have, according to the concession of Prof. Stuart, the Protestant church with us as to the method of computing prophetic time, they must be equally with us as it respects the meaning and general scope of the prophecy. And this is not left to an inference from an admission. The testimony of the highest authorities of the religious world, will show how fully we are sustained in the points specified.

1. *The fourth kingdom of Daniel.* This we claim to be the *Roman*. In this view we have the support of the ablest and most judicious expositors of every age. William Cunninghame, Esq., of England, an eminent expositor, in speaking of the four parts of the great image of the dream of Nebuchadnezzar, says, that they "are respectively applied by Daniel himself to *four kingdoms, which have, by the unanimous voice of the Jewish and Christian churches, for more than eighteen centuries, been identified with the empires of*

Babylon, Persia, Greece, and *Rome*." Should this be questioned, the witnesses are abundant. In the Jewish Church, we have the Targum of Jonathan Ben Uzziel, Josephus, and the whole modern synagogue, including the names of Abarbanal, Kimchi, David Levi, and others. In the Christian Church, such as Barnabas, Irenaeus, Chrysostom, Cyril of Jerusalem in his catechism, Jerome, and according to him, all ecclesiastical writers, Hyppolitus and Lactantius, in the early ages; since the Reformation, Luther, Calvin, Mede, T. H. Horne,\* Sir Isaac Newton, Bishop Newton, Dr. Hales, Scott, Clarke, Brown,† Watson,‡ Bishop Lloyd, Daubuz, Brightman, Faber, Noel, Dr. Hopkins, and we might add, almost every biblical expositor of any note in the Protestant church, if we except a few who have written in our own country within a year or two. And it is quite needless to add, that those who make this application of the four parts of the image, have no difficulty in making a like application of the four beasts of Daniel seventh. The remarkable similarity of the two visions requires this.

2. *The little horn of the seventh.* This we hold to be Papacy. This is no novel view of that symbol, being, as it is, the view of the whole Protestant world. See Dr. Clarke's

\* See Introduction, vol. 1, p. 333 ; vol. 4, pp. 189, 191.

† See Harmony of Scripture.

‡ Theol. Dic., p. 228.

Notes on 2 Thess. ii. chap., Croly on the Apoc., pp. 113—117, Horne's Int., vol. 4., p. 191, Watson's Theol. Dic., p. 62, G. T. Noel, Prospects of the Church of Christ, p. 100, William Cunninghame, Esq., Political Dest. of the Earth, p. 28, Mede, Newton, Scott, Daubuz, Hurd, Jurieu, Vitringa, Fleming, Lowman, and numerous others of our best standard expositors.

3. *The little horn of the eighth chapter, that became EXCEEDING GREAT.* This we believe to be *Rome*. Such was also the opinion of Horne.\* Vol. 4, p. 191. Sir Isaac Newton, Bishop Newton, Dr. Hales, Martin Luther, Dr. Prideaux, Dr. Clarke, Dr. Hopkins, Wm. Cunninghame, and others. In addition to these, almost all the old writers, who applied it to Antiochus Epiphanes, did so only as the type of Rome, where they looked for the Antichrist. St. Cyril, Bishop of Jerusalem, in the fourth century, said, "This, the predicted Antichrist, will come when the times of the (Pagan) Roman empire shall be fulfilled, and the consummation of the world approach. Ten kings of the Romans shall rise together, in different places indeed, but

\* We here give a remark of this standard author : " Sir Isaac Newton, Bishop Newton, and Dr. Hales, have clearly shown that the Roman power, and no other, is intended ; for, although some of the particulars may agree very well with that king, (Antiochus,) yet others can by no means be reconciled to him ; *while all of them agree and correspond exactly with the Romans ; and with no other power.*"

they shall reign at the same time. Among these, the 11th is Antichrist, who, by magical and wicked artifices, shall seize the Roman power."

4. *The length of the prophetic numbers.* On this, little proof need be offered, as there is probably no point on which Protestant commentators have been so well agreed, as that the *days* in Daniel and John are representatives of so many *years*. Faber, Prideaux, Mede, Clarke, Scott, the two Newtons, Wesley, and almost every expositor of note, have considered this a *settled question*. Indeed, so universal has been this interpretation of these periods, that Professor Stuart says, in his Hints, p. 74, "IT IS A SINGULAR FACT THAT THE GREAT MASS OF INTERPRETERS in the English and American world, have, for many years, been wont to understand the *days* designated in Daniel and the Apocalypse, as the *representatives or symbols of years*. I have found it difficult to trace the origin of this GENERAL, *I might say* ALMOST UNIVERSAL CUSTOM."

5. *The commencement of the seventy weeks.* These we believe commenced with the decree of Artaxerxes Longimanus, to restore and build Jerusalem, according to Ezra seventh, B.C. 457. This has, also, long been considered by commentators to be a settled point; and it probably would not now be disputed, were it not for a desire to avoid the conclusion to which it brings us, on the supposition that it is

the beginning of the 2300 days. On so settled a point as this, we need only mention such names as Horne, (see Int., vol. 1, p. 336, vol. 4, p. 191,) Prideaux, (see Connection, pp. 227—256,) Clarke, (see Notes on ninth Daniel,) Watson, (Theol. Dic., p. 96,) William Howel, LL. D., (Int. of Gen. His., vol. 1, p. 209,) Scott, and Cunninghame.

The two remaining points are those, which, among that class of our opponents who in the main agree with us in the preceding, are the most seriously questioned, and respecting which less light is afforded by biblical expositors. And yet in our views of these we are sustained by the general views and reasonings of many expositors, and by the direct testimony of the most able writers.

6. *The connection between the 2300 days and the seventy weeks.* This connection we think plain, and in proving it we are much aided by the learned world. This aid is furnished both directly and indirectly—a few plainly testifying to the fact of the connection—the many affording us one of the most decisive arguments proving it. The argument is based upon the literal meaning of the Hebrew word, which, in our version of Daniel ix. 24, is rendered “determined.” That the word means literally, *cut off*, or *cut out*, we have the highest authority. This fact, viewed in the light of the circumstances in which Gabriel appeared to Daniel, as stated in the ninth chapter, and the instruction given, must be



decisive proof of the connection between the two periods. Daniel had had a vision before this time, reaching to the time of the cleansing of the sanctuary. This he was told would be at the end of 2300 days. At the time Gabriel appeared to him, he was earnestly praying for the restoration of his people, and the cleansing of the sanctuary, having previously ascertained from books that the seventy years of captivity had expired. The angel, having received orders to fly swiftly, appeared to Daniel, and stopped him in the midst of his prayer, and gave him further instruction. He directed him to "*understand the matter, and CONSIDER THE VISION.*" A reference to that would teach him that the object of his prayer could not then be granted, the end of the 2300 days being far in the future. The angel then assured him that seventy weeks were *cut off* for his people and city, during which time Jerusalem should be rebuilt, with the walls, and at the end of which an atonement should be made for sin by the death of Messiah; and after that the city and sanctuary should be destroyed, and remain desolate until the consummation or completion of the time, and that which was determined should be poured upon the desolate. Now, as this was evidently an explanation of the vision of the 2300 days, and as the seventy weeks were *cut off from, or out of, it*; and as the instruction of Gabriel reached beyond the termination of those weeks, to

the destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans, and onward, during a long period of desolation, to the consummation or completion; the inference seems irresistible that the seventy weeks are not only a part of the 2300 days, but the first part of them. This being so, the commencement of the two periods must be the same. But I will here allude to authorities for thus rendering the word. It will not be too much for me to say, that this is nearly or quite a settled point among the best scholars. In an old work, entitled, "A six-fold commentary on Daniel," published in London, A. D. 1608, I observe it is rendered *cut out*.

Dr. Gill, a distinguished divine and scholar, thus renders the word, and quotes many of the first critics, who agree with him.

Hengstenberg, who enters into a critical examination of the original text, says,—“But the very use of the word, which does not elsewhere occur, while others, much more frequently used, were at hand, if Daniel had wished to express the idea of determination, and of which he has elsewhere, and even in this portion, availed himself; seems to argue, that the word stands, from regard to its original meaning, and represents the seventy weeks in contrast with a determination of time (*en platei*) as a period cut off from subsequent duration, and accurately limited.” *Christology of the Old Test.*, vol. 2., p. 301. Washington, 1839.

Gesenius, in his Hebrew Lexicon, gives *cut off* as the definition of the word; and many others of the first standing, as to learning and research. And, besides, several versions have thus rendered the word.\* And we might add, that this is admitted to be the true rendering of the word, by our best Hebrew contemporaries, such as Bush and Seixas, though opposed to our views.

We also have the direct testimony of

\*A Hebrew scholar, of high reputation, makes the following remarks upon the word which is translated "determined," in our version.—The verb *chathak* (in the Niphal form, passive, *nechtak*) is found *only* in Daniel ix. 24. Not another instance of its use can be traced in the entire Hebrew Testament. As Chaldaic and Rabbinical usage must give us the true sense of the word; if we are guided by these, it has the *single* signification of CUTTING, or CUTTING OFF. In the Chaldaeo-Rabbinic Dictionary of Stockius, the word "*chathak*" is thus defined:

"Scidit, abscidit, conscidit, inscidit, excidit"—*To cut, to cut away, to cut in pieces, to cut or engrave, to cut off.*

Mercerus, in his "Thesaurus," furnishes a specimen of Rabbinical usage in the phrase *chāthikah shelbasar*—"a piece of flesh," or "a cut of flesh." He translates the word as it occurs in Dan. ix. 24, by "*præcisa est*"—*WAS CUT OFF.*

In the literal version of Arias Montanus, it is translated "*decisa est*,"—*WAS CUT OFF*; in the marginal reading, which is grammatically correct, it is rendered by the plural, "*decisae sunt*"—*were cut off.*

In the Latin version of Junius and Tremellius, *nechtak* is rendered "*decisae sunt*"—*were cut off.*

Again, in Theodotion's Greek version of Daniel, (which is the version used in the Vatican copy of the Septuagint as being the most faithful,) it is rendered by *συνετμήσαν*, "*were cut off*," and in the Venetian copy by *τετμήνται*, "*have been cut.*" The idea of *cutting off* is pursued in the Vulgate; where the phrase is "*abbreviatae sunt*," have been shortened.

Thus Chaldaic and Rabbinical authority, and that of the earliest versions, the Septuagint and Vulgate, give the SINGLE SIGNIFICATION OF CUTTING OFF TO THIS VERB."

Prof. Bush, the learned Joseph Wolfe, and others of our day, that the seventy weeks are a part, and the first part, of the two thousand three hundred days. Dr. Wilson, of Cincinnati, who is the highest authority in the Presbyterian church, in a recent discourse "On cleansing the Sanctuary," says,—"I undertake to show—that Daniel's 'seventy weeks' is the beginning, or first part of the 'two thousand three hundred days,' allotted for the cleansing of the sanctuary: that Daniel's 'time, times, and a half' is the last or concluding part of the two thousand three hundred days." This may be deemed sufficient on this point.

7. *The rise of the little horn of Daniel seventh.* We believe that Papacy, symbolized by the little horn, rose by virtue of the decree of Justinian, and not that of Phocas, or any other ruler, or power. This decree, though issued A. D. 533, did not, as we conceive, go into full effect until 538, when the enemies of the Catholics in Rome were subjugated by Belisarius, a general of Justinian. In this view, as to the rise of Papacy, we are sustained by Croly, (see his work on Apoc., pp. 113—117;) G. T. Noel, (see Prospects of Ch., p. 100;) Wm. Cunningham, Esq. (Pol. Destiny of the Earth, p. 28;) Keith, Vol. 1, p. 93; Encyclopedia of Rel. Knowl., art. Antichrist; Edward King, Esq., and others.

It is thus we are sustained, in the views we cherish, by the plain teaching of the

prophetic pages, and by the highest authorities of the religious world. In all the points that are disputed, we have the sure word of prophecy to guide us, and the best of human authority to sustain us. This fact will put to blush the accuser, who charges us with holding *novel*, *fanatical*, and *heretical* views. Let him thus charge the high authorities quoted above—men of the most distinguished talent and extensive learning, the brightest ornaments of the church, and the best standard expositors. With them, in the path of truth, we feel we shall not suffer.

In the light of what has been shown, to what conclusion are we necessarily brought? If we are right in the points considered, the conclusion is not to be resisted that the *end is at hand*. If we are not mistaken as to the *extent* of the prophetic field, the *length* of prophetic time, and the *dates* from which to reckon such time, all must concede that the present period is that which is to witness the grand termination of all earthly things. And the Christian world assure us, that, in the main points, we cannot be mistaken. As to particular dates, we have such high authority, such light from the prophetic pages, such confirmation from the events of Providence and the characteristics of the present times, as to give foundation and strength to our faith. We must, in all honesty, believe, in view of the accumulating evidences around us, and the prophetic dec-

larations before us, that the reign of Christ, long looked for and desired, is near at hand. May it be hastened !

Now this prophecy has been fulfilled, or is to be, or it has failed. To say it has failed, is to be infidel ; to say it has been fulfilled in events and circumstances far inferior to those the language would warrant us to expect, is to be scarcely less so ; and to say that it is to be fulfilled, without being able to show, from the book itself, that there is yet ground to expect it after so long a delay, is hardly to rescue the prophecy from the hands of infidels. And it might with equal justice be added, that so to interpret the prophecy as to turn away its force from the prominent systems of error now prevalent, is to favor and countenance those systems. In the light of these facts, where does the learned Stuart stand ? A few references to his book will show. A review of that book, will not, in this discourse, be expected ; a mere glance at its general character, is all that time will allow. It is not his to do small things—his is the work of a Hercules ! It is not his to meddle with the flaws and foibles of systems, but to show how readily he can demolish the works of generations ! Intoxicated by German literature, driven on by mingled ambition and a desire to check the prevalence of a hated system, he dashes on through his book, regardless of the work of ruin and havoc he effects ! That we may

understand the vastness of his undertaking, he is careful to assure us, at the beginning, that his leading principle of interpretation is in opposition to the expositors of the English and American world—in fact, to those of nearly the whole Protestant world. But there is another world on which the Professor had his eye, and the exception of which, explains volumes—the German world! Deriving his leading principles from thence, he girds himself for his work. He stops not to prove, or even to argue positions assumed in opposition to the host of Protestant interpreters—he is not giving a “*Thesaurus*, but *hints!*” Points entirely settled in the Protestant church, he decides, without any proof or argument to the contrary, to be undoubtedly otherwise. The little horn of the seventh of Daniel, declared, by the almost unanimous voice of Protestants, to be the symbol of Papacy, he thinks to be “undoubtedly” Antiochus! p. 83. With as much propriety, and no more in opposition to the opinions of that portion of the religious world, I might say that Josephus undoubtedly was Cyrus! He unites with the expositors of the Romish Church in saying, that there is no Papacy in Daniel. He proceeds, and pares, and fritters, and cuts down the whole book, and attempts to make it fit the inch-measure of his *day for a day* principle. And thus the most valuable portion of this book is attempted to be crowded into the narrow limits

of *six years and a fourth!* Its importance is to be measured by the acts of a single Syrian prince! The destruction of the little horn, the burning of the fourth beast, the coming of the Son of man with the clouds of heaven, the judgment, the time for the saints to possess the kingdom, the cleansing of the sanctuary, the end of indignation, the standing up of Michael to reign, the time of trouble, the deliverance of those written in the book, the resurrection, the standing of Daniel in his lot, and the shining of the wise as the brightness of the firmament, and those who turned many to righteousness as the stars, all took place at the death of that prince, in 164 B. C.!! This is the result to which the work conducts us. But how poor his success in making the stubborn prophecy conform to his principle! In applying the prominent symbols of Daniel to that prince, with the periods given, he PRESUMES the application is nearly just—*statistical exactness not being expected*. (See pp. 88, 89, 122.) But how plain it must be to all, that this method of interpreting, or rather misinterpreting, this book, so long the Christian's Calendar, makes it the sport of infidels, and gives it over to Romanism, and other kindred systems of error and iniquity.

And then he comes to the Apocalypse. And what havoc there! Consistency required that he should carry out his principle with respect to that book, though the task was



more difficult. After diligent search, he finds a hero for the Apocalypse—*it is Nero!* He then has space sufficiently narrow to admit of the use of his measure. But he does not stop to inquire, or even to notice, the date of the book; which, of itself, would have been enough to have arrested him in his progress. The weight of authority, he well knows, is in favor of fixing the date of that book as it is in our large Bibles, viz., 96. The testimony of nearly all the early writers favors this date.\* If this is the correct date, the hero of the Apocalypse had been dead nearly thirty years before it was written! It cannot be that this book *foretold* things that had passed! But this point is not noticed by the Professor. He assumes that it was written before Nero's time, and applies the larger portion of the book to him and his successors, who finally destroyed Jerusalem. All that has, by Protestants, been applied to papacy, he makes symbolical of Nero! The coming of Christ, so often mentioned in the book, he construes to be his coming for the destruction of Jerusalem!—And thus does he aid, most effectually, the three great errors specified: *Infidelity*, by adopting Neological principles of exposition, and, consequently, making very little of the prophecies: *Papacy*, by uniting with the Romish interpreters, and attempting to take from Protestants their most effectual weapon against

\* See Croly on Apocalypse.

that system: *Universalism*, by surrendering to its adherents those portions of the Scripture we have used the most effectually against them. And it should be observed, that the supporters and advocates of these systems of error, begin to be sensible of the efficient aid rendered them by the Professor. Already do they claim him as an accession to their number. This is more particularly true, with respect to the supporters of the last system named. They hesitate not, in their several papers, to speak of him as a convert to their views, and as a powerful ally of their cause.\* And the adherents of the other systems are not unaware of his position, or insensible to the value of his services, though they have not made so public a manifestation of their gratification.

And now what have we left us, according to the views of our opponent, on which to rest our faith, and by which to be guided and cheered, as to the future? We are out upon the ocean of the world, in a moonless and starless night, without rudder, compass,

\* A Universalist periodical, published in Connecticut, thus speaks of him :

"We have often had occasion to note the progress which is manifestly going on in the mind of this world-famous theologian. We are certainly not wrong in the opinion that, for several years, his views have been growing liberal, more enlarged. \* \* \* He is casting off, with a giant's strength, the trammels of Calvinistic theology, and making his way into the liberty and light of a broader and better faith. We find evidences of it in every work which comes from his pen. We are not sure that Stuart is yet a Universalist in his views of the Divine government, but there are many passages in his writings which seem strongly to indicate that he is not far from the kingdom of God."

or chart ! And when we apply to our masters for information respecting our position, direction, and progress to the destined port, we are told there are no means of knowing ! that it is best and wisest we should know nothing about them ! The prophecy is applied to days long since passed away, and all in the future is dark and uncertain ! This is the condition in which we are left by such works as Stuart's, and others following in his steps.

And giving, as our opponents do, the 24th of Matthew and kindred portions of the New Testament to the Universalists, they yield so much as to make it difficult to prove a future personal coming of Christ at all. If such Scripture, so strong and expressive, so demonstrative of a personal coming, is to be regarded as figurative, or, at most, as only intended to teach a spiritual or providential visitation, it must be extremely difficult, and we believe impossible, to prove a personal coming. And especially is this so, after the Apocalypse is wrested from us, and applied to events closing with the destruction of Jerusalem, by some of the most learned writers of the age. To this fearful result do the reasonings of our opposers directly bring us !

So it is most evident, that to oppose our views with any degree of success, positions most novel, startling, and dangerous, are taken. Settled points are questioned and denied ; old and unquestioned principles of

interpretation are abandoned ; the plainest biblical teachings are misconstrued, and the whole host of expositors set at naught. Daniel is given to a Syrian prince, the Apocalypse to a Roman emperor, and Matthew and the parallel books to the destruction of Jerusalem ! And all this to avoid the doctrine of the Lord's speedy coming ! How much like the course of the Jews, to avoid the conclusion that Christ *has* come the first time ! By the most sophistical and unfair means have they attempted to dispose of the *seventy weeks*, within the limits of which the Messiah was to make his first advent, to justify themselves in their unbelief ;—so, by similar means, do our opponents attempt to dispose of the 2300 days and other like periods, which limit the time of the second advent, to justify their unbelief respecting the time of that advent. In this they show a strong affinity to the Jews. And it is not a little remarkable that both classes are stumbled, perplexed, and pressed by the same general period ; the Jews by the first part of it, and our opponents by the concluding part ! But the Jews have not yet been able to dispose of the 70 weeks ; nor have our opponents been able to dispose of the remainder of the 2300 days. The event distinguishing each, is wholly independent of the belief of mortals. At the appointed time, the first occurred ; so will the second, whatever may be the scepticism respecting it.

But to close. It does appear that after a slight examination, all candid persons must see and admit, that, on the supposition that our theory be false, it is far less absurd and dangerous than those which have been ex-cogitated and offered as substitutes for it; that it is less infidel, less paradoxical, less adapted to ruin the souls of men. Such an examination will show that the methods of our opponents, in opposing our views, supposing them to be wrong, have been like an attempt to put down the Unitarian views of the Unity of God, by Polytheism; or the pretensions of Joe Smith, by an effort to prove that prophets in all ages have been impostors; or, in other words, that a lesser error has been sought to be put down by a greater! And it will be seen, by such examination, that if we err, we err with the wisest and best of men in all ages; that we err on the side of the accredited expositors of the Protestant church; that we err in the plain path of prophetic teaching; that we err, if at all, with comparative safety, because on the side of too great love for the Saviour's appearing! But if we err, our opposers have a fearful account to settle with the world and with God! The world and God will hold them responsible for the doctrines they now advance and oppose to our views. I fear for the result! Did I believe we should fail, I should prefer, by far, my position to that of the opposers. I should hesitate not at all as to

the ground to be chosen, knowing the issue that has been made up. I choose not to share in the fearful account to be settled with Infidels, Catholics, Universalists and Transcendentalists, should time continue. The positions, the works, of this controversy, are not to be forgotten. The eye of the eagle has been upon our opposers; every sentiment, and turn, and shift, and change, has been observed, marked, and treasured for future use. At another day, they must be apprized of them. Should they attempt, hereafter, to meet these errorists, they would so turn their own weapons against them, as to drive them quickly and in confusion from the field. Some begin to see the danger, and to give the alarm.\*

Thus much, supposing we fail. But if we are right, how perilous the condition of opposers! What a position in which to meet the Judge of all the earth! We envy not such a meeting! Lord, forbid that such should be my lot! Let us, then, all wait patiently for Him who shall come to take the kingdom, and reign. Though he tarry beyond a given time, let us daily watch. We may be fully assured that the great principles on which our faith and hopes are based, *are true*, AND WILL ABIDE FOREVER. All things admonish us,—the events of the past, the occurrences of the present, and the fore-shadowings of the

\* See an excellent article in the New York Evangelist, on this subject.

future,—*that the reign of Christ is at hand!*  
“*For yet a little while, and he that shall come*  
*will come, and will not tarry.*”

“Come, then, and, added to thy many crowns,  
Receive yet one, the crown of all the earth,  
Thou who alone art worthy!” Amen!

The following Address of the Tabernacle Committee was read on the opening of the Tabernacle.

## TO THE PUBLIC.

FRIENDS AND FELLOW-CITIZENS:—

God, in his providence, has permitted us at length to realize the accomplishment of this long-hindered work,—the erection of our Tabernacle. The object for which it is specially designed, the plan and character of the edifice, together with the unforeseen, and of course uncontrollable circumstances which have marked its history thus far, have combined to make it a subject of general public interest. We have no doubt, however, that more important purposes have been effected by its delay than could have been by its earlier completion. It has been the means of calling attention to the views intended to be promulgated in it, though mirth or malice may have employed the means, at the same time that the story of its varying fortune, as the representative of a most important cause, has served as a test upon the candor and Christian liberality of the public; and although a source of perplexity to its friends, we trust it has not been without some salutary influence upon them. Well, let God's work be done in his own way, whether our plans succeed or fail. In this case, however, the work was be-



gun with a view to the glory of God, as well as our own convenience in his worship. He has directed the circumstances of its history, and we would say, as Solomon said of the more wonderful and imposing temple, at its dedication, "The palace is not for man, but for the Lord God."

Of our views as believers in the Second Advent doctrine, as declared to the world by Mr. Miller, all certainly must have heard. And although they have been widely promulgated, in accordance with the means God has given us, still, as we had reason to expect of a certain portion of the community, who are too indolent or self-conceited to read with candor that which has not the sanction of popular favor, or perhaps offended that the truth and reasonableness of what they have read gave them everything to fear, and determined to oppose the doctrine as they must, if at all, with sophistry and falsehood, our views are not unfrequently misrepresented. It may not be amiss, on the opening of the TABERNACLE, to give a brief exposition of our position.

With the Synopsis of Miller's Views, already published to the world, all Second Advent believers in the main agree. In the application of particular prophecies, there is often a variety of views, but which in no case affects the fundamental principles of our faith.

It has been generally supposed that the passing by of a mere point of time would *test* the truth or falsity of our views. This is by no means the case. Our views are based upon divine truths, which will be none the less true however great a lapse of time may intervene before their fulfillment. That much time will intervene, we do not

believe; but till the fulfilment of the events for which we look, we shall ever hope and pray, "Come, Lord Jesus, come quickly."

We will not knowingly embrace any principles not plainly taught in the word of God; and if we cannot stand on the plain letter of that word, we choose to fall.

In believing that this earth, regenerated, is to be the eternal abode of the "children of the resurrection," and that the great and glorious promises of Isaiah and the other prophets which are applied to a millennial state, are to be then fulfilled, we are sustained by the belief of the church in its purest and best ages; and in proof of which we have the testimony of not a few divines and historians in every age.

In opposition to this view, there is no trace of any belief in the primitive church from the time of our Saviour prior to Origen, who flourished in the middle of the third century.

Bishop Newton says, "the doctrine of the millenium was generally believed in the *first three and purest ages*; and this belief, as the learned Dodwell has justly observed, was one principal cause of the fortitude of the primitive Christians; they even coveted martyrdom, in hopes of being partakers of the privileges and glories of the martyrs in the first resurrection."

In the first two centuries there was not an individual who believed in the resurrection of the dead, whose name or memory has come down to us, that opposed it; nor does there exist any fragment of the writings of any author that denied it. The testimony also is, that it was received *from*

*those who saw our Lord*, and heard of him respecting those days.

Thomas Burnet, in his "Theory of the Earth," printed in London, A. D. 1697, states that it was the *received opinion* of the primitive church, *from the days of the apostles to the council of Nice*, that this earth would continue six thousand years from creation, when the resurrection of the just and conflagration of the earth would usher in the millennium and reign of Christ on earth.

As Popery arose, it became less prominent, but was revived at the reformation, and was not supplanted by the doctrine of a temporal millennium till the time of Daniel Whitby, who died 1728. It is also admitted by all that this was taught by Barnabas, Papias, Polycarp, bishop of Smyrna and disciple of John, Justin Martyr, Irenæus, Turtullian, bishop of Carthage, Cyprian, Lactantius, Methodeus, bishop of Olympus, Epiphanius, Paulinus, bishop of Antioch, &c., who were contemporaries and successors of the apostles. This belief was adopted A. D. 325 by the council of Nice, which consisted of 318 bishops, from all parts of Europe, Asia, and Africa. In the reformation, this was the belief of Tyndel, Luther, and Calvin. It was also the belief of the martyr Bradford, Goodwin, Gouge, Langley, Bunyan, Wesley, Burnet, the learned Joseph Mede, Fletcher, Horsley, Bishop Newton, Sir Isaac Newton, Milton, Sterry, Cotton Mather, and a host of others. In asserting this doctrine, we therefore only comply with the apostolic command, to earnestly contend for the faith once delivered to the saints.

The accomplishment of this glorious promise

must be the next great event in historical prophecy, when have been fulfilled all the events predicted, which were to precede the consummation; and be it remembered, that the only prophecies claimed by our opponents to be unfulfilled, are those which they claim belong to a temporal millennium and the restoration of the Jews.

These predictions we have shown, by thus far unanswered arguments, drawn from the word of God, to apply only to the eternal state of the righteous in the regenerated earth, and in the restoration of the true Israel of God to their everlasting state, according to the sure promise of God made to our father Abraham. As, therefore, no events of prophecy, now unfulfilled, precede the Second Advent, we shall not turn aside from the expectation of the immediate fulfilment of these glorious promises—even if there should be any seeming delay, until we can say, “Lo, this is our God; we have waited for him, and he will come and save us.” We have no expectation of retiring from the contest till our King appear. We have enlisted for the war. Should time continue, the contest is well begun. Should the Saviour come to-day, we intend to be at our posts. With regard to the time of that event, we expect it in the “fulness of times;” in the fulfilment of all the prophetic periods, none of which have yet been shown to extend beyond A. D. 1843. We are therefore looking for it at this time. Six thousand years from creation was the time when the primitive church was expecting the advent. And Luther, Bengel, Burnet, Fletcher, Wesley, and others, all had their eye at about this period of time. But now the fulfilment of the prophecies,

the end of the prophetic periods, and the signs of the times, admonish us that it is truly AT THE VERY DOORS.

The public have been deceived by the secular and religious press, with regard to particular days and months that it is said the Saviour was expected. There are too many difficulties in the way of fixing with certainty on any particular day, to render it safe to point to such with any degree of positiveness, although, to some minds, more probable circumstances may seem to point to some particular days, than others. When these days have been named by our brethren, they have been only their own individual opinions, and not the opinions of their friends. The cause is therefore not responsible for any such limited views and calculations.

We occupy the same ground that we have always occupied, in accordance with the title-page of all Mr. Miller's lectures, viz., that the second advent will be "ABOUT the year 1843." The 23d of April, to which all our opponents have looked, was never named by any of our friends, but only by our enemies. To maintain the belief of the coming of Christ now at the doors, to restore this earth to its Eden state, and restore to it the righteous, we claim the same right that any of our opponents have to present a contrary belief. And we mean to be put down neither by the spiritualizing of the word of God, and wresting its alphabetical and common-sense meaning, or by the sneers, scoffs, sarcasms, or falsehoods of those who oppose us—the only forms of opposition with which we have had to contend.

When it is shown, by sound argument, and the

sure word of God, that no second personal coming of Christ, and restoration of this earth to its Eden state, is taught in the Scriptures, then we shall cease to look for the coming of the Lord; and not till then. We are ready and anxious to meet any and all candid arguments which may appear to any to militate against these truths; and we claim an equal privilege to present, in return, the strong arguments and the promises of God upon which alone we stand. In the discussion of this great question, the truth or falsity of which vitally affects every son and daughter of Adam, we ask for a candid hearing, and are willing to abide an impartial examination.

In support of our positions, we rest solely upon the testimony of the word of God, in its plain, obvious, and literal acceptation, and as understood by the apostles and their immediate successors. To the law and the testimony we appeal; for we expect none other things but what Moses and the prophets have said shall come. We place no reliance whatever upon any visions, or dreams, mere impressions, or private revelations. "We have a more sure word of prophecy, whereunto ye do well that ye take heed, as unto a light that shineth in a dark place, until the day dawn and the day-star arise in your hearts." "Search the Scriptures," said our Saviour; and from them we profess to be able to give a reason for the hope that is in us, to every man that asketh us. Neither have we any confidence in the stability of those whose hopes are based upon impressions, and not upon the word of God; for when their impressions are gone, their hopes will disappear with them. But the word of God endureth for-

ever, and those whose hopes are grounded upon it cannot be shaken, whatever may betide.

We have no sectarian designs; our sole object is to convince the churches and the world that the Bridegroom cometh, that all who will may prepare for his glorious appearing. We never have, nor do we now recommend that any leave their respective communions. We have no controversy with any of the religious sects of the day, or existing ecclesiastical organizations, as such. Our standard of Christian character and fellowship, is to love the Lord our God with all our heart, and strength, and mind, and our neighbor as ourself—walking soberly, godly, and righteously in this present evil world, doing good as we have opportunity.

Second Advent believers are found in all branches of the Christian Church; and when we come together we all meet on common ground. We therefore deem it highly improper that any professed Second Advent believer should make his peculiar individual or sectarian views prominent in his professed Second Advent labors. We claim no right to dictate to any one what shall be his individual belief, or in reference to his ecclesiastical relations. We have no ecclesiastical organization, and wish none. We permit all to worship God according to the dictates of their own conscience; and expect the same privilege for ourselves. We have nothing to do with any of the contested doctrinal points that agitate the churches; nor have we approved the introduction of personal and private speculations, which may have led to unprofitable discussions.

It has been claimed by our opponents that the

tendency of these views is to produce insanity. But it is questioned whether a single case can be produced where a *believer* has become insane on account of such belief. Those who cannot appreciate the truth may suppose them insane, as some of old were supposed to be full of new wine, and Paul was said to be mad; or those whose views rest only on dreams and impressions may exhibit insanity in their excesses; but these are not principles we advocate. It is also believed that fewer cases can be found of insanity, in connection with Second Advent views, in proportion to the believers, than can be produced in connection with ordinary religious teaching. The promises we present are so glorious and cheering, being none other than those the primitive church were told to "comfort each other" with, that, to the humble inquirer after truth, they would be much more likely to restore to sanity, than to render insane; and such, it is believed, have been their practical tendency.

The above is a condensed statement of our views and expectations; we will now give the object for which the Tabernacle is opened. This has been erected for the accommodation of those citizens of Boston and vicinity, who may wish to come and learn from the word of God the reason of the hope that is in us. It will be occupied principally for lectures, where it is intended the truth shall be presented in a clear, rational, and candid manner, so that it may commend itself to the reason and good sense of all impartial hearers, and, taking root in their hearts, lead them to repentance, that they may bring forth the peaceable fruits of righteousness. We intend to permit no extravagances here, but to have everything done



decently and in order, so that those who assemble may not only have their hearts benefitted, but their minds enlightened. We repudiate all fanaticism. Our wishes are to reach the heart through the intellect, rather than the feelings. We, therefore, cordially invite all disposed to an impartial examination of the Bible, to come and hear for themselves. "Come now, and let us reason together," saith the Lord.

In the conclusion of this address we can but add a word in relation to—

**DANGERS WHICH BELIEVERS IN THE DOCTRINE OF THE SECOND ADVENT SHOULD AVOID.**—So long as we are in this world, we are continually exposed to temptations on every hand; for our adversary the devil goeth about like a roaring lion seeking whom he may devour. He also transforms himself into an angel of light. He is peculiarly anxious to secure in his wiles those who have escaped, or are endeavoring to escape, from his grasp; and if any point is unguarded, that is sure to be the point of attack. Some individuals are the more liable to fall into one class of errors, and some into another, owing to their peculiar temperament and the circumstances in which they are placed; and so it is with classes and communities. Some dangers are peculiar to certain views; and others are common to all. The dangers to which Second Advent believers are exposed, are by no means peculiar to them, but yet are not the less real.

1. We should avoid a censorious spirit towards those who cannot see all things in the same light that we do. We should remember that once we were in the dark, but were none the less honest in our opinions then, than now. If others are

honest in their views, and are candid, they are entitled to the utmost charity. Censoriousness belongs only to those who oppose the coming of Christ.

2. Second Advent believers are from all religious denominations ; and to act in unison, it is necessary to meet on common ground ; to so meet, it is necessary to lay aside all sectarian views. All true brethren should, therefore, guard against making their own private views or sectarian belief too prominent, or as a necessary belief for those whose views are different.

3. We should avoid bringing in, in connection with the Second Advent and as a preparation therefor, any doctrines not necessarily connected therewith. They only serve to divert the mind from the true issue, and repel those who might otherwise embrace the doctrine of the Second Advent. Heb. xiii. 9 : " Be not carried about with divers and strange doctrines : for it is a good thing that the heart be established with grace ; not with meats, which have not profited them that have been occupied therein."

4. We should avoid all extravagant notions, and everything which may tend to fanaticism. God is not the author of confusion. " Let everything be done decently and in order," says the Apostle. And " If any man offend not in word, the same is a perfect man, and able also to bridle the whole body." " But the wisdom that is from above is first pure, then peaceable, gentle, and easy to be entreated, full of mercy and good fruits, without partiality, and without hypocrisy ; and the fruit of righteousness is sown in peace of them that make peace." Anything which may cause an unbeliever to turn away in disgust, may pre-

vent the salvation of that soul. All things that are lawful are not expedient. As our great aim should be the salvation of souls, we should strive to win all, so that if by any means we may save some of them.

5. We should avoid placing too much reliance upon *impressions*. "Believe not every spirit, but try the spirits whether they be of God." Impressions, visions, and dreams have thus far usually failed those who have put their trust in them; which proves they were not of God. We, therefore, should use the utmost caution ere we trust to that which may also in the end fail us, and prove not to be of God. We have for our guide the sure word of God; and those who will not believe Moses and the prophets, will not believe though one should rise from the dead. He that is of the faith of our father Abraham, will believe God upon his simple word; and will need no other confirmation: but those who refuse to take the word of God without some other testimony, are dishonoring that word, and giving the pre-eminence to that which may be doubtful or spurious testimony. Jer. xxiii. 28, 29: "The prophet that hath a dream, let him tell a dream; and he that hath my word, let him speak my word faithfully. What is the chaff to the wheat? saith the Lord. Is not my word like as a fire? saith the Lord; and like a hammer that breaketh the rock in pieces?"

6. Judge no man. James iv. 11: "Speak not evil one of another, brethren. He that speaketh evil of his brother, and judgeth his brother, speaketh evil of the law, and judgeth the law: but if thou judge the law, thou art not a doer of the law, but a judge."

7. We should avoid setting up one's own experience as the standard by which to test the experience of others. Men's experience will differ, as did those of the apostles. Had Paul required all to have the same experience that he had, the faith of many would have been staggered. The moment we set up our own attainments as a standard, we cease to point to Jesus, the only true pattern. We should look to him alone, and point others to him. 2 Cor. x. 12: "For we dare not make ourselves of the number, or compare ourselves with some that commend themselves: but they, measuring themselves by themselves, and comparing themselves among themselves, are not wise."

8. "Let him that thinketh he standeth take heed lest he fall." We are commanded to live with an eye single to the glory of God. Without holiness no man can see the Lord. We are to abstain from even the appearance of evil, and to depart from all iniquity, that the God of peace may sanctify us wholly unto himself, and preserve us blameless unto the coming of Christ. We should, therefore, avoid feeling that we have reached a point from which we cannot fall; for our adversary is continually on the watch, that he may overcome us at our least guarded point. He likes to whisper in the ear of man that he has attained the victory, and become so holy, that, do what he will, it is not sin. Some have thus stumbled, supposing their warfare was accomplished; and have thus ceased to press forward towards the mark, so that Satan has led them captive at his will. It will never answer to leave our watch, or lay down the weapons of defence; for while we are probationers our course is a continual

warfare, a race, a strife for the victory ; and that victory can only be obtained by being faithful unto the end. There is no danger of being too holy : the danger lies in being satisfied with present attainments.

9. We are commanded to occupy till Christ comes. We are to sow our seed, and gather our harvest, so long as God gives us seed-time and harvest. If we improve the coming seed-time, and have no harvest, we shall have done our duty ; and if a harvest should be granted us, we shall be prepared to reap. It is as much our duty now to be continually employed, either in providing for the wants of those dependent upon us, or in alleviating the distress of others, as it ever was. We are to do good as we have opportunity, and by no means spend our time in idleness. That would bring reproach on our Saviour. Let us see to it that our hearts are right in the sight of God, and then, whether we wake or sleep, are laboring to save souls, or are engaged in our daily avocations, we shall meet our Lord in peace. May the God of peace give all who profess to love his appearing that wisdom, that shall guide us aright, and lead us in the way of all truth, and redound the most to his honor and glory.

Prescott Dickinson,  
 Frederick Clapp,  
 William M. Hatstat,  
 Stephen Nichols,  
 John Lang,  
 Micajah Wood,  
 Joseph G. Hamlin,  
 John Augustus,  
 Joshua V. Himes,

} *Tabernacle  
 Committee.*

# DEPOT OF SECOND ADVENT PUBLICATIONS,

14 DEVONSHIRE ST., OFFICE OF THE "SIGNS OF THE TIMES."

---

All communications relative to the *Signs of the Times*, and Publications on the Second Advent, should be addressed to JOSHUA V. HIMES, 14 Devonshire Street, Boston, Mass.

## Important Works

### ON THE PROPHECIES OF THE SECOND ADVENT OF OUR LORD AND SAVIOR, JESUS CHRIST.

*Miller on the Second Coming of Christ.*—In one volume. This work contains nineteen Lectures; to which is added a Supplement, containing a Chronological Chart of the prophetic periods, with an explanation. Price 50 cents.

*Miller's Life and Views.*—In one volume. This work contains a Sketch of Mr. Miller's Life, his Chronology, the Chart and Exposition, eleven new lectures, reviews, letters, &c. Price 50 cents.

*Bible Student's Manual.*—This work is compiled from Mr. Miller's works, designed for a pocket note-book and manual. It contains the Chart, Rules of Interpretation, &c., with blank paper, for notes. Price 25 cents.

*An Address to the Public*, and especially the Clergy, on the Near Approach of the Glorious, Everlasting Kingdom of God on Earth. By J. Litch. Price 25 cents.

*No. I., Second Advent Report of General Conference*, held in Boston, Oct. 14th, 15th, 1840. This is a very able and important document: it contains two discourses from Mr. Litch, on the Second Advent—Chronology of Prophecy. One from Rev. Henry Jones, on the Restoration of Israel. Two from Mr. Miller, on the Chronology of the Prophetic Periods—Judgment. One Discourse, in three parts, by H. D. Ward, on the Millennium. 174 pages. Price, 37 cents in boards, 25 cents in pamphlet.

*No. II., Second Advent Report of General Conference*, held in Lowell, June 15th, 16th, 17th, 1841. This is a very able and important document: it contains the Proceedings of the Conference, Circular Address, Dissertation on Christ's Second Coming, Signs of Christ's Second Coming quickly, by Rev. Henry Jones. The Kingdom of God on Earth at hand, the Fall of the Ottoman Empire, and Dissertation on the Millennium, by Rev. Josiah Litch. Price \$20 per hundred, and 25 cents single.



